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Family and Community in Ireland
Introduction

In the early 1930s, two young American anthropologists, Conrad Maynadier Arensberg and Solon Toothaker Kimball, lived among the people of north Clare and the townspeople of Ennis. Using what they observed and what they were told, they wrote about the lives, relationships and economy of the small farmer class and the people of the town. This book, *Family and Community in Ireland*, is one product of their work. Arensberg and Kimball’s account of life in a number of rural communities in Clare in the first half of the 1930s is a detailed study of family and kin, of life and work, of mutuality in social and economic relationships among the small farmer class. They reveal a story, chapter by chapter, of the importance and centrality of the family as a social and economic system which produced and reproduced a self-sufficient, traditional rural community. Documenting the ‘minutiae of social life’, this book presents a view of the ‘Old World from the inside’ by two ‘outsiders’ from the ‘New World’, ‘a document expressing a point-of-time in the social life of rural Ireland’ (p.viii).  

Following ethnographic research methods, Arensberg and Kimball produced an account of a well-established and distinctive way of life for individuals and their communities. This account, they argued, could explain Ireland’s peculiar and puzzling demographic patterns: persistent emigration, population decline, delayed marriage and high rates of singleness. The logic and rationale of the agricultural family system, as they saw it, protected the economic and social welfare of the ‘complete’ family and their property. As they reconstruct this story, Arensberg and Kimball offer insights into a way of life of which many fragments persist still, some remain vivid in memory, and others would have been forgotten without their book to recall them.

The authors put forward a humane, often sympathetic version of the everyday details which they saw and which were described to them. The first part of *Family and Community in Ireland*, published first in 1940, concentrates on small family farms, reconstructing the practicalities giving

---

1 In this Introduction, page numbers where no date is given refer to the facsimile of the 1968 edition of *Family and Community in Ireland* reproduced in this volume.
rise to the way life was lived there. The remaining six chapters forming Part 2 contain material on the town of Ennis, collected at the time but first added to the volume in 1968. Many of the questions asked by the text focus on the daily business of living, exploring the ways in which different aspects of people’s behaviour fitted together to make up a coherent form of life. How were households run? How did parents relate to their children? How was property passed on? What casualties, conflicts and depths of family affection were centred on the world of a small farm? In Ennis, how did shopkeepers learn their trade, what did they need to do from day to day, and how did they relate to the people of the countryside? Perhaps this aspect of life in Ireland has since changed even more than life on the land, for the intricacies of commercial life at that time have been overtaken by entirely different ways of working.

Contrary to what is sometimes claimed, Arensberg and Kimball do not describe a static, changeless society. They emphasise not only the facts of conflict and change, but the special way in which they were dealt with by Irish society in the early part of the twentieth century. For these authors, change wrought by economic or technological demands continually impinged on the ways Irish people lived, but it was absorbed at a pace allowing it to fit the way of life pursued by the members of the community. Habits, beliefs and values were not abandoned in order to adapt to economic change; economic change was adapted to them. By describing processes such as these, this book raises questions about the ways in which human beings live in communities, about the relations between individuals and the societies in which they live, about how to understand other societies, and how to understand our own.

Arensberg and Kimball were writing at a time of intense change within the study of society itself. In the preface to the 1940 edition of *Family and Community in Ireland* (included here), the young anthropologists’ supervisor, William Lloyd Warner, mounts a defence for social anthropology. He argues for new methodological approaches to the study of modern society, necessary for a ‘full grown comparative social science of man’ (p.xiii). In order to expand the range of types of societies in their analysis, the Harvard Irish Study came to Ireland in the summer of 1931 and stayed until 1936, though most of the anthropological work was complete by 1934. Far from associating it with
‘exotic’, far-flung societies, Arensberg and Kimball saw ethnography - the attempt to write about the way of life of a people - as an interdisciplinary matter. For them, it involved sociology as much as it did anthropology, and their methods are similar to many pursued by social scientists today.

In this Introduction, we first of all discuss the type of society to be found in the Ireland of County Clare at the time when Arensberg and Kimball were there. Anthropologists speak of ‘traditional’ societies as opposed to ‘modern’ ones, and these authors saw Clare as in transition between the two. We explore this question as we outline some main aspects of Irish society shortly after Independence, with the conflicts and disputes which influenced it. Ireland was not, of course, a terra incognita at that time. We make brief reference to other attempts by observers from abroad to record accounts of the country before coming to Arensberg and Kimball themselves, and the overall intellectual project of which their work was intended to form part. We tell the story of the Harvard Irish Study (1931-1936), focusing on the social anthropology research process, from its inception in the US to the observational and interviewing work in Clare. The role of national and local contacts which made the work possible is described, with the choice of Clare as a study location and the way in which the young Americans settled there to carry out their work. The history of the Harvard Irish Study is now only beginning to unfold, and we relate it here for the first time.

We go on to address the status of this text within the history of sociology and anthropology in Ireland. What has given it its pre- eminent position, and how has it been received by subsequent writers? Some of the arguments this book has generated seem to us to rest on misunderstandings. Many have been caused by misinterpreting the authors’ intellectual intentions, reading their work without reference to its historical context. Arensberg and Kimball’s attempts to understand human social life were more subtle and more interesting than some later commentators have claimed. We try to indicate this before going on to outline some main features of the book itself. We are conscious that here we can only begin to address the debates raised by an astonishing text which stimulates questions of lasting excitement and importance.
In this Introduction to the facsimile copy of the 1968 edition of *Family and Community in Ireland* we invite you to move back in time with us as we reconstruct the motivations, personalities and events which brought the Harvard Irish Study to Ireland, calling to mind the local reception of the American ‘experts’ (‘Praegers’ as visiting scholars were called on Clare Island), bearing notebooks, trowels and callipers. We wish to tell a story that is now more than 70 years old, revealing the research process which can be glimpsed through elusive evidence in the texts, documents and letters left by the Harvard Irish Study. As the research context is reconstructed, new meanings emerge and different interpretations can be made, allowing us to reconsider the significance of this text in the history of the development of the study of Irish society.

**Ireland in the 1930s: A Traditional Society or a Modern one in the Making?**

Although Arensberg and Kimball were inclined to see Ireland as a transitional society that was neither wholly modern nor wholly traditional, the account they present in *Family and Community in Ireland* has frequently been perceived as offering a picture of a traditional society. How ‘modern’ or ‘traditional’, we can therefore ask, was the society the Americans encountered in the Ireland of the early 1930s? Before attempting to answer such a question, we must pause for a moment to get a glimpse of what it means to have a modern or a traditional society in the first place. This is a question about which there is no universal agreement. There are those who consider
the notions of the ‘modern’ and the ‘traditional’ too general, and too based on historically privileged western experience, to be useful or even acceptable.²

Taking the experience of the USA during the period of organised capitalism as exemplary,³ a very simple model of a western modern society can nonetheless be assembled. This would suggest that these modern societies are liberal democratic in their political organisation, market-led and industrialised in their economies, and have cultures that tend to be individualistic and pluralistic. Pluralism implies a separation of church and state and a range of beliefs and practices that are respectful of differences in a way that moves in the direction of what would nowadays pass for multiculturalism.

How do these very simple pictures of modern political, economic and cultural life apply to the Ireland of the 1930s? The economy of 1930s Ireland had taken shape in line with political and economic structural changes, most of which had their origins in the nineteenth century. What historians have called the ‘post-Famine adjustment’ saw an increasing pastoral emphasis develop in Irish agriculture. Cattle farming became the mainstay of the new pastoralism in the south. The cattle economy’s spatial organisation saw the southern dairying counties produce an annual surplus of calves, the western counties (Clare included) becoming specialised store cattle producers, and the counties of the rich grazing belt of north Leinster devoting themselves to the finishing of fat cattle. An important consequence of the new pastoralism was that it was grass extensive, in a way that encouraged the formation of larger holdings and the appearance of a large-scale grazier or ‘rancher’ class (Jones 1995).

Some nationalists objected to the large-scale grazing system on the grounds that it enriched the few and impoverished the many, thereby precipitating flight from the land and the decline of rural communities. A series of land agitations in the early decades of the twentieth century, often orchestrated by local nationalists, helped keep alive the issue of restructuring the cattle economy by means of redistributive land reform, at least in certain

²A good summary of the difficulties with the terms ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’ can be found in Tipps (1973).
parts of Ireland (see Bew 1987, 1988; Jones 1995; Varley 1988). Since the formation of the Congested Districts’ Board in 1891, the State in Ireland had begun to accept the need for redistributive land reform, at least in the poorer ‘congested’ counties of the west (including Clare). Not until the passing of the 1909 Land Act did the land reform efforts of the Congested Districts’ Board amount to anything of real significance, and what progress was then made was soon halted by the outbreak of the 1914-18 war. Under political independence, the Congested Districts’ Board was abolished in 1923 and its land reform functions assigned to the Irish Land Commission (see Micks 1925).

At the beginning of the twentieth century Ireland had a major centre of heavy industry in Belfast, a centre that was destined to become part of a separate jurisdiction with the partition of Ireland in 1920. The industrialisation of Belfast and the north-east of Ulster did not dissuade late nineteenth century Irish nationalists from developing an analysis which suggested that Ireland had done poorly in economic terms under the Act of Union of 1800, and that she would remain economically subordinate within the United Kingdom for as long as the existing constitutional arrangements continued. Arthur Griffith, the founder of Sinn Féin and a notable early twentieth-century exponent of this position, proposed early on that political independence should be used to lay the foundations of an industrial society in southern Ireland, based on protected import-substituting industrialisation (see Cullen 1969: 120-2; Kennedy and Johnson 1996: 49-59).

For a variety of reasons, Griffith’s programme was not implemented in the first decade of native rule (Daniel 1976). All this was to change fundamentally with the appearance of the anti-Treaty Fianna Fáil party in 1926, and its spectacular rise to become the dominant force in Irish politics. As the main opposition party in parliament after 1927, Fianna Fáil adopted much of Griffith’s economic programme and pledged itself to pro-smallholder land reform, diminishing the pastoral character of Irish agriculture and

---

3Organised capitalism, in the discussion of Scott Lash and John Urry (1987: 3-7), lasted from the 1870s to the 1960s.

4Commenting on the decision by the American ethnographers to focus on the Irish smallholder and the favourable treatment the smallholders receive in their hands, Gibbon and
promoting a form of spatially dispersed import-substituting industrialisation. Once Fianna Fáil (with Labour Party support) had won power in 1932, it introduced policies aimed at accelerating land reform and attempting to stimulate a native-owned, protected form of industrialisation (see Daly 1992).

How ‘modern’ were Irish polities in the 1930s? It was Ireland's spatial proximity to England in circumstances of a failed rebellion and a botched French invasion which, at the close of the eighteenth century, ‘prompted the attempt to convert it from a colony with a separate administrative and political identity to an integrated periphery of the imperial state itself’ (Garvin 1981: 4). Under the Act of Union, control of the state apparatus in Ireland continued in the hands of a largely English senior administrative staff, directly commissioned by the London government and headquartered at Dublin Castle.

In the course of the nineteenth century, through the medium of the popular campaigns associated with Daniel O’Connell, Michael Davitt and Charles Stewart Parnell, Ireland was to present the wider world with a picture of what modern popular politics would look like. Alongside the popular politics that revolved around charismatic leaders, popular movements and mass membership parties, can be found a very different mode of exerting pressure on the state - the physical force tradition of revolutionary nationalism, associated with the Irish Republican Brotherhood (the Fenians) and later with the Irish Republican Army.

By 1900 a re-united Irish Parliamentary Party that had formally put the Parnell split behind it had materialised, but its appearance did not put an end to opposing tendencies within anti-colonial nationalism nor prevent the emergence of new rival groups. The divisions within nationalism gathered around disputed aims (devolved home rule versus outright political separation) and what were considered to be legitimate tactics (physical force versus constitutionalism) (Garvin 1981: 106-118). Competition between the Irish Party and Sinn Féin was to dominate the politics of the second decade of the new century. Ultimately a restructured Sinn Féin movement, closely linked with physical force nationalism in the years after the 1916 Rising, swept

Curtin (1978: 446) comment that ‘Family and Community became heavily impregnated with the romanticism of the locally dominant, contemporary political ideology.’
the Irish Party from the political landscape in the watershed general election of 1918.

Sinn Féin, in the aftermath of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 that ended the War of Independence (1919-1921), split into pro- and anti-Treaty factions. The split in Sinn Féin was unfortunate but the civil war that followed it was truly disastrous. Crucial to the preservation of democracy in the new Free State (and the ultimate triumph of the constitutional over the physical force tradition in southern Irish politics) was the formation of Fianna Fáil, as a political party representing the defeated side in the civil war. Its establishment, and the peaceful transfer of power to the anti-Treatyites after the general election of 1932, were to mark critical junctures in the history of the constitutional tendency in Irish politics (Prager 1986). The IRA, of course, did not disappear with Fianna Fáil’s appearance. Referring to County Clare, Eunan O’Halpin (1999: 113) notes how ‘relations between police and republicans had been particularly bitter for years’. The Fianna Fáil government, in power for most of the politically and economically turbulent years of the 1930s, was to move not only against the Irish ‘shirted movement’ known as the Blueshirts, but ultimately against the IRA as well.

Was the culture of the Ireland which Arensberg and Kimball encountered in the 1930s modern? Many commentators accept that there were powerful tendencies inimical to modern individualism at work in 1930s Ireland. Family life among the Clare smallholders, in Arensberg and Kimball’s own account, can be described as ‘traditional’ in the sense which involves a strong customary expectation that the group should take precedence over the individual. Custom provides the means by which the internal life of the community no less than the family is substantially ordered.

At the level of the state, much energy was being expended on the creation or regeneration of a national culture. Behind the movements to revive the Irish language, Gaelic games as well as the Irish-Ireland project, can be found a desire to define and cultivate a distinctive sense of Irish identity (see Hoppen 1999: 142-6; Brown 1981: 56-7; Maume 1995; de Búrca 1980: 27, 90-1). Cultural regeneration, in particular the use of the Irish language in state education and civil service recruitment, was to be vigorously promoted by the new state during the early decades of native rule. Alongside the
cultivation of the indigenous, there was a fairly comprehensive attempt made to keep certain foreign cultural influences out of the country.

The Catholic Church in Ireland was broadly sympathetic to these developments. The Irish bishops in the years after the civil war, in John Whyte’s (1984: 24-5) account,

...evidently believed that the traditional standards of their people were under unprecedented pressure. New mass media – the cinema, the radio, and above all the English sensational newspapers, whose circulation in Ireland appears to have increased during the twenties – were bringing unfamiliar values to the attention of their flocks.

Several commentators have developed the theme that the Catholic Church’s influence on Irish society was to tighten considerably in the decades after the creation of the Irish Free State in 1922 (see Hoppen 1999: 264-72). Certainly the post-Independence state, while not a theocracy in any strict sense, was heavily influenced by Catholic moral teaching in many of the policies it adopted in the social sphere. The outlawing of divorce, the ban on artificial contraception, the imposition of censorship became the cornerstones of an approach whereby the state, even if not acting strictly at the behest of church élites, came to legislate in a way that was extremely mindful of the requirements of Catholic tenets of morality (Whyte 1984: 60).

Lawrence Taylor (1995: 141) points out how ‘the financially struggling’ Irish state came ‘to rely on the Church not just for moral leadership and ethnic identity but for its institutional structure’. In particular, Church involvement in formal socialisation via its control over primary and secondary schooling gave the clergy a crucial power base. In many other ways, too, the Catholic clergy came to carve out a dominating leadership role in local society.\(^5\)

A prominent feature of Irish society in the inter-war period was the disimprovement in the position of women. While the franchise had been further extended to the advantage of Irish women in 1922, several initiatives

\(^5\)Reflecting on Arensberg and Kimball’s (1968) account of Irish Catholicism, Taylor (1995: 250) observes that they ‘...have very little to say on the subject, an omission that could only be intentional at a time when the institutional Church was at the absolute apogee of its political power as well as cultural authority.’ Gibbon and Curtin (1978: 446) suggest a specific reason why the Americans ‘paid little attention to religion.’ ‘The significance attached by Arensberg and Kimball to the small farm’, is to be read in their view (1978: 446), ‘...as not simply an empirical mistake but also as a reflection of the contemporary ideological power of one aspect of Fianna Fáil’s republicanism [its pro-smallholder stance] and its clerical endorsement’. 
were adopted by the new state in the 1920s and ’30s aimed at either excluding women or restricting their participation in critical regions of public life. The introduction of a whole series of measures (affecting, for instance, civil service employment, jury service, the availability of divorce, the importation and sale of contraceptives) whose appearance amounted to nothing short of ‘statutory discrimination on the basis of sex’ has been documented (Clancy 1999: 209). Depressed economic conditions in the 1930s, and the prominence of the Catholic view that woman’s true calling was domestic rather than public, made the social and political climate severely hostile to notions of gender equality.

Can we conclude, on the basis of what has been said, that Ireland was more a traditional than a modern society in the 1930s? Any answer to this question depends on what we understand to be traditional and modern. Our brief survey of the economy, when set in the context of our simple model of what an economy in a western modern society would broadly look like, indicates that there were both modern and traditional features in evidence in Irish agriculture. The ‘traditional’ smallholders of western counties such as Clare, while undoubtedly involved in producing for their own subsistence, were simultaneously an integral part of the export agriculture built around the cattle trade. Fianna Fáil’s interest in industrialisation marks it off as a force for modernisation, though it dreamed (in its early economic nationalist phase) of achieving industrialisation on its own terms. The very appearance of Fianna Fáil, in opposition in 1927 and in power in 1932, reflects the ascendancy of the constitutional tendency that our simple model takes to be the hallmark of modern politics.

In view of the conservatism that marked family life, the Catholic Church and the state, it might be tempting to conclude that Irish culture was becoming more deeply traditional in the inter-war years. Yet, the context in which this traditionalism flourished is at once revealing and ambiguous. The Irish bishops in the years after the civil war, in John Whyte’s (1984) account, were fearful that elements of individualism (especially egoistic individualism) were seeping into Irish culture. The bishops
found cause for dismay in many different areas. Their pastorals abound in denunciations of intemperance, gambling, perjury, crimes of violence and many other evils. But there was one sphere in particular which aroused their alarm. By far the most prominent topic in their published statements was the decline in sexual morality (Whyte 1984: 24).

The presence of such individualistic elements, and the fear they generated on the part of the powerful, speaks of a potentially explosive mix of traditional and modern elements in inter-war Irish culture.

**Views of Ireland from Outside**

Observing a culture from the outside brings with it special problems, but by Arensberg and Kimball’s time, Ireland had been much described by foreign observers. Much that had been written concerned other matters than life in the countryside: politics, religion, the affairs of the aristocracy, or matters of general concern such as the natural sciences. But for centuries travellers to Ireland had recorded impressions about how people got their livings, dressed, spoke, or passed their leisure time. Such early attempts to come to terms with understanding other cultures were to culminate in the formidable dedication of the German, Scandinavian and English scholars who had contributed to the analytical reconstruction of the Irish language and the life associated with it, before Arensberg and Kimball arrived.

The extreme poverty found in Ireland is a recurrent theme of visitors’ reports during some hundred and fifty years before Arensberg and Kimball’s work. It is emphasised, famously, in the reports of Arthur Young, the agricultural improver, after his tour of 1776-1779. At the turn of the nineteenth century, de Latocnaye’s *A Frenchman’s Walk Through Ireland* (1796-7) reports that “The misery of the people is generally attributed in Ireland to the manner in which estates are left” (1798, 1984: 126): a rich man lets his land to others who sub-let it and sub-sub-let it further. Alexis de Tocqueville visited Ireland in 1835, again recording the poverty of the people and the bitter, universal condemnation of aristocratic mismanagement of the
country (1835, 1990: 49). He passed through Ennis, but tells of it only how an elderly travelling companion relayed his memories ‘of the great persecutions’ in Ireland, describing ‘with a terrifying exactitude and local memory’ the dispossession of estates (1835, 1990: 91-2).

Writers came from a variety of European origins. Pueckler-Muskau’s visit to the country in 1828 made him one of a small number of German visitors to reach the West of Ireland at that time, but by mid-century at least three major works on the country appeared in Germany (Rasche 1995: 87). During the nineteenth century, visits to Ireland became standard enough for touristic responses to be organised. Wordsworth rode the rapids at Castleconnel in 1829 (Kavanagh 1994: 208-9), apparently taking for granted the assistance of boatmen to visitors there. Thackeray’s visit to Ireland in 1842, after which he published his *Irish Sketchbook*, offers a sometimes flippant account which makes clear that guide-books were already a familiar feature of travel in Ireland. His visit to Bunratty Castle shows that it had already become a tourist attraction (1843, 1990: 152-4). Ennis, Thackeray reports, is ‘a busy, little, narrow-streeted, foreign-looking town, approached by half a mile of thatched cott’ (1843, 1990: 155). ‘The town was swarming with people; the little dark streets, which twist about in all directions, being full of cheap merchandise and its vendors’ (1843, 1990: 156). Thackeray comments primarily on the prettiness of the girls in Ennis, and the folly of respect for rank (1843, 1990: 155). He too, however, emphasises the poverty throughout the country as soon as one leaves the great houses.

The theme of Ireland’s poverty, often linked with astonishment at the cheerfulness and loquacity of country people, was paralleled by more romantic ideas about the mysterious periphery of Europe. Much of this was

6A penetrating account of the catastrophe of the Great Famine in Ennis and environs is to be found in Ó Murchadha (1998).
8 Marie-Anne de Bovet wrote an account of her three months in Ireland in 1889 in which, in Clare, she praises the unaffected charm and ‘douce indolence’ of the bathing resort, Kilkee (1890, 1997: 228), which Charlotte Bronte had visited on her honeymoon in 1854 (Kavanagh 1994: 209). De Bovet comments on the relative ease with which it is possible to travel within Ireland, if one is prepared to tolerate a little discomfort. She too comments on the hardships which farmers may be forced to bear and the consequent agrarian crimes (1890, 1997: 245).
sparked by the Ossianic writings of James McPherson, lauding the pleasurable melancholy of the Celtic fringes of Europe (Dwyer 1991). Writing of the ways in which Ireland became imagined, Leerssen emphasises ‘the European mode of imagining the periphery’, where ““time stands still”...in the backwaters, in the lost corners’; ‘lost in a cyclical, natural or static time-warp, forgotten by history, bypassed by history’ (1994: 4). Such romanticism coloured a flight by tourists from the increasing urbanisation of Europe (Byrne et al., 1993). This penchant for quiet and solitude, far from fast-flowing modernity, accompanied the natural scientific interests of Robert Lloyd Praeger, who inspired naturalists’ clubs all over the country. In 1909-11 he initiated the Survey of all animal, vegetable and mineral aspects of Clare Island. Praeger finds ‘something infinitely satisfying about those wide treeless houseless undulations, clothed with heather and Purple Moor Grass’ (1951, 1980: 160). His memoirs of walking through Ireland compare with those of many writers in the 1930s and 1940s. They are talkative, colourful, personal reminiscences of quaint incidents interspersed with botanical observations as he walks along.

The romantic image of Ireland was countered in the latter part of the nineteenth century by physical anthropologists who propagated a view of the Irish as negroid and even simian (Curtis 1968). The English journal Punch went so far as to caricature the Irish in the shape of a dancing monkey, though Foster (1993: 173-4) emphasises that this image is far from summarising the complexity of English attitudes to Ireland at the time. More sympathetic and intelligent Anglo-Irish accounts of nineteenth-century Irish rural society include W. Steuart Tench’s Realities of Irish Life, or the novels of Jane Barlow, which achieve something closer to an inside impression of the exigencies of life lived precariously in the West of Ireland. Nonetheless, purportedly scientific support for stereotypes did nothing to undermine a general assumption of the inferiority of Irish people and culture. According to Kiberd, where the English saw themselves as ‘controlled, refined and rooted’, ‘so it suited them to find the Irish hot-headed, rude and romantic, the perfect foil to set off their own virtues’ (1995: 9).

This was not the view taken by the scholars from England, Germany and the Scandinavian countries who at the end of the nineteenth century set
about a systematic study of the Irish language and the social life that sustained it. The work of these men was most similar to that of Arensberg and Kimball, since in order to learn Irish they came to live in the West of Ireland, many in the Blasket Islands. Carl Mastrander was proud of his acceptance as one of them by the islanders (Mac Conghail 1987: 136), and it was he who encouraged Robin Flower to spend time in the Blaskets during the second decade of the twentieth century. In contrast to the transient visitors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Flower, with other scholars such as George Thomson and Kenneth Hurlstone Jackson, repeatedly spent prolonged periods living among the people. They established a serious academic community in connection with the Blaskets which helped encourage those who lived there in the production of their own work - notably Tomás Ó Crohan’s autobiography, *The Islandman* (1929, 1937), to which Arensberg refers in his 1936 lectures. These foreign scholars sat at the feet of the local inhabitants and took instruction in the rich culture handed down to them. Like Arensberg and Kimball, they were trying to learn about a society by living within its everyday habits and rhythms.

**The Harvard Irish Study, 1931-1936**

In the politically and economically tumultuous years of the 1930s, a team of American academics arrived in Ireland to carry out archaeological and anthropological research. This research, directed by Professor Earnest Hooton (1887-1954) of the Anthropology Department in Harvard University, became known as ‘the Harvard Irish Survey’ hereafter called the Harvard Irish Study or the study.9 There were three disciplinary strands to the study: archaeology, physical anthropology and social anthropology. Hooton co-ordinated the archaeological research programme in Ireland, a racial survey of the people and a social and economic survey of the country (Shapiro 1954). Fieldwork for the study began in 1931 and finished in 1936. The archaeologists were first in

---

the field, followed by the social anthropologists and later the physical anthropologists. At any given time there were at least two to three of the American academics from each discipline working in Ireland. The study is known by the separate activities and publications of the three strands. However little has been written about the history and general purpose of the study, the interconnections between the three strands and the background and interests of the American anthropologists and archaeologists who came to Ireland in the 1930s.

One of the few published detailed academic accounts of the study is provided by Hooton in his preface to the *Physical Anthropology of Ireland* (1955). Having received a large grant of $25,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation for research to be carried out by the Harvard Department of Anthropology, the idea of an anthropological survey of Ireland comprising archaeology, social and physical anthropology became feasible.

This ambitious project called for a series of archaeological excavations designed to cover the whole period of Irish prehistory and proto-history, an intensive social anthropological study of a typical Irish county (Clare) and an adequate sampling by physical anthropologists of the Irish populations in every part of the island (Hooton *et al.* 1955: v).

Mildred Warner, accompanying her husband to Ireland, Lloyd Warner, the director of the social anthropology survey, also recorded her memories of the initial discussions which led to the final project.

...During discussions over tea at the Hootons’ and in the smoking room of the Peabody Museum, the idea was suggested of studying a small country from the total anthropological perspective, archaeology, physical anthropology, perhaps linguistics and social anthropology. Earnest Hooton was intrigued and thought it might be possible to raise research funds among the members of the large Irish community in Boston... The Committee on Industrial Physiology became interested since Ireland met their criteria for a community primarily not industrial. Not only was it an agrarian society but small enough in geographic size and population to be encompassed in one project. Thus the ideas for a research that came to be known as the Harvard Irish Survey were developed, with Hooton the director of the archaeology and the physical anthropology and Lloyd to direct the work in social anthropology. The goal was to involve three fields
of anthropology in the study of the origin and development of the races and cultures of Ireland.\textsuperscript{10}

The intended interconnectedness of the three strands can be discerned from press statements and correspondence in relation to the Harvard Irish Study. In an unpublished account of the Harvard Anthropological Survey in Ireland, Hooton writes about the ‘intensive co-operative study of Ireland by archaeologists, social anthropologists and physical anthropologists’.

The object of this research is to attempt a scientific interpretation of a modern nation, the country of origin of more than one-fifth of the population of the United States. Social Anthropologists have investigated the social, political, economic and industrial institutions of a large typical sample of the Irish people. Archaeologists have excavated their prehistoric and historic monuments to discover the background of Irish civilisation. A physical anthropologist is now measuring and observing the bodily features of thousands of Irish to determine their racial affinities and their constitutional proclivities. Ultimately all of this material will contribute to a single unified anthropological history and analyses of this gifted and virile nation.\textsuperscript{11}

Hooton proposed that the sociological data from Clare and other parts of Ireland would be ‘correlated with the racial physical types of the present population and with cultural archaeological remains which illuminate the past’.\textsuperscript{12} However, the intention to correlate the results of the Harvard Irish Study and subsequently to publish those results never became a reality. Hooton refers to the lack of funding as the research progressed, and the difficulties, once field work is complete, in keeping together a research team comprising young graduate researchers who take up paid employment elsewhere. The anthropologists and archaeologists received travelling expenses and funds for subsistence, but did not receive any remuneration for their work on the Harvard Irish Study. It is also clear that the Second World War was disruptive; it absorbed the time and labour of some of the key


researchers on the study. As time passed, possibly the general research purpose no longer cohered or made as much sense as was the case initially.

We can perhaps learn more about the Harvard Irish Study by focussing briefly on each of the three strands and the activities and interests of the main protagonists. This background information is important if we are to understand the context within which the Harvard Irish Study tried to make progress across the three strands of its activity. Each strand of the study shared the common problem of having to negotiate ‘access’ to their respective ‘subjects’. A comparison of the strategies used in the three strands to negotiate access is highly revealing.

The context presented by the Ireland of 1932 is also especially fascinating. By the time Arensberg arrived in Clare in the summer of 1932, the government of the Irish Free State was in the hands of Fianna Fáil and the trade dispute with England (known as the ‘economic war’) was in its early stages. The volatility of the political situation was apparent to Lloyd Warner. Writing to Hooton in July 1932, he expressed his fear that a fresh outbreak of civil war was possible if not imminent.

Speaking of de Valera reminds me of the political situation here at the present time. I think England has played very rottenly and this fellow J. H. Thomas [Dominions Secretary] is more than a damned fool. England and Ireland are now engaged in a ruinous economic war which may ultimately result in a civil war here in Ireland - which seems to me one of the things which J. H. Thomas aimed for since it is part of the English strategy to force de Valera out and bring Cosgrave’s Cúmmna nGhael (sic) crowd back. It has resulted so far in making a greater portion of the Irish people back de Valera than had formerly been in his Fianna Fail party. The possibilities of civil war are everpresent and it is generally understood that I.R.A. gunmen are quietly organizing and importing arms and ammunition from America to start a revolution if de Valera’s policies fail, or if de Valera becomes more moderate.13

Warner’s comments concerning the personality of a young man designated to assist him while in Ireland are also telling in relation to the fraught political situation.

His personality is a little too loud and too egocentric to be of help in research in a country which is likely to be in civil war at any moment.

Even though civil war break outs I do not believe that Connie [Arensberg] or properly trained graduate students will have any trouble here. In fact in some ways it might help our work since we could see how the antagonistic elements divided with more clearness than at the present time.\textsuperscript{14}

In Ireland, the products of the archaeological survey are well known and documented, as almost every excavation was published in Irish journals, notably the \textit{Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy} and the \textit{Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland}.\textsuperscript{15} The social anthropology strand is best known because of two publications, \textit{The Irish Countryman} (1937) and \textit{Family and Community in Ireland} (1940, 1968) while the physical anthropology was in part published as \textit{The Physical Anthropology of Ireland} (1955). Most of our attention will be given to the social anthropological work which is the subject matter of this third edition of \textit{Family and Community in Ireland}.

The Harvard Irish Study was a lengthy and expensive undertaking, particularly in view of its origins in the Great Depression. From the American side, boosted by the Rockefeller funds, the Divisional Research Fund of the Harvard Department of Anthropology was supplemented by the Harvard Peabody Museum and the American Council of Learned Societies, and by a large number of private individuals with Irish American interests (the Harvard Friends of Irish Anthropology).\textsuperscript{16} Use was also made of various other sources such as the Milton Fund, the Wenner-Gren Foundation and travelling scholarships such as the Sheldon Travelling Fellowship. The Irish Free State also made funding available for labour and research, with money being channelled through the Board of Works and the National Museum of Ireland. By 1939 Harvard University had donated $33,049.54, the Irish and Northern Irish regimes had donated $9,075.00 while individual donations (mostly

\textsuperscript{14} Warner to Hooton, July 26, 1932. The Hooton Papers, 995-1, Box 21-6. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.

\textsuperscript{15} For a more detailed account of the Harvard Irish Study with a focus on the archaeological and anthropological strands, see Paul Gosling and Anne Byrne, 'The Harvard Irish Study (1931-1936)', unpublished paper.

\textsuperscript{16} Hooton attributes the portioning out of the Rockefeller grant to Professor A. M. Tozzer for the Irish Study. 'At the time of the Rockefeller grant to the Department, Professor A. M. Tozzer was Chairman of the Department and was chiefly instrumental in securing this important subvention. He was most generous in earmarking substantial shares of that grant for the Irish Study' (Hooton \textit{et al.} 1955: ix).
American) amounted to $16,365.77, totalling $58,490.31.\textsuperscript{17} Of the three strands of the study, the archaeological work absorbed most of the funding, followed by the social anthropology and the physical anthropology.

The duration of the Harvard Irish Study in Ireland consisted of five summers of archaeological field work from 1932 to 1936. Two years of observation and interviewing were completed by the social anthropologists, between 1932 and 1934. The physical anthropologists travelled throughout the island for extended periods, from early 1934 to the summer of 1936.

\textit{Hooton, Dupertuis, Dawson and the Racial Survey of Ireland}

Earnest Hooton, the director of the Harvard Irish Study and a physical anthropologist, taught Anthropology in the University of Harvard for much of his career (1913-1954). For the same duration he was also the Curator of Somatology at the Peabody Museum. At the time of his appointment, he was the only physical anthropologist who was a full-time teacher and is identified as the person responsible for the development of Physical Anthropology in the USA (Shapiro 1954). His intellectual interests and contacts were wide ranging, but he is best known for his research on human evolution, racial differentiation, the classification and description of human populations and criminal behaviour.\textsuperscript{18} He wrote a number of books on physical anthropology which achieved popular appeal. These include \textit{Up From the Ape} (1931), \textit{Apes, Men and Morons} (1937), \textit{Twilight of Man, Why we Behave like Apes and Vice Versa} (1940) and \textit{Young Man You are Normal} (nd). His more controversial publications concerned the relationship between personality and physical type, particularly concerning the connection with criminal behaviour. Having carried out a survey of the criminal population in the US to determine whether criminal behaviour was linked to racial or physical factors, he produced \textit{The American Criminal} (1939) and \textit{Crime and the Man} (1939).

Hooton was responsible for the general design, organisation and fiscal management of the Harvard Irish Study. It seems that he himself never visited Ireland during the study, but oversaw the work from Harvard. He was

\textsuperscript{17}Letters of Appeal for Financial Assistance, 995-1, Box 21-10, The Hencken Correspondence, The Hooton Papers, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.
however involved in designing the physical anthropology strand, a racial survey of Ireland to ‘obtain a clear picture of the racial composition of the Irish people’ (Hooton et al. 1955: 4). The racial survey was carried out by C. Wesley Dupertuis, who was described by Hooton as ‘an advanced student of Physical Anthropology at Harvard’. Dupertuis had spent two years measuring and observing visitors to the ‘Century of Progress Expedition’ in Chicago. His first Irish work lasted a few months, from January to May 1934. Returning with his wife, Helen Dupertuis, as his ‘recorder and collaborator’ in December 1934, the two continued with the collection ‘of anthropometric data for the racial survey of the males of Ireland’ until May 1936. Involving journeys amounting to over 45,000 miles, to some 426 different localities, 125 detailed measurements were collected for each of 10,000 adult men in every county in Ireland, north and south, including the Aran Islands and the Blaskets. Rural rather than urban locations were preferred on the grounds that country people were likely to be more representative of Irish racial types and ‘less likely to be mixed with recent foreign blood than would be the city dwellers’ (Hooton et al. 1955: 8). Measurement was made of weight, stature, facial and head measurements, the presence of freckles, whether a person had ‘straight, curly, frizzly or woolly hair’, colour of eyes, forehead slope, caries, teeth loss and nasal profile, as well as ‘sociological observation’ concerning age, religious affiliation, educational level, occupation and knowledge of the Irish language.19

Helen Dawson, funded by a National Research Council Fellowship, joined the physical anthropology survey in 1935, measuring some 1800 Irish women in Donegal, Leitrim, Sligo, Mayo, Galway, Clare and Kerry. She also collected extra ‘sociological’ data from the women concerning marital status, number of siblings and number of children. We know that some 12,000 individuals acquiesced to being measured by the physical anthropologists. ‘Standard anthropometers’ were used, as well as ‘sliding and spreading callipers’. Hooton assures us that no ‘head-spanner’ was used, an instrument

---


which can make ‘the subject feel as if he were being suspended by ice-tongs introduced into his ear’ and that ‘a few trials of this procedure render the securing of further subjects for measurement almost impossible’ (Hooton et al. 1955: 12).

Before the actual process of securing and measuring volunteers, the Dupertuisises toured Ireland in a car to first observe the local inhabitants, noting ‘the unusual combination of dark hair and blue eyes’ (Hooton et al. 1955: 4). Having decided to measure a representative sample of men in several localities in each county, they hired well-known young men as ‘whippers-in’ and ‘drummers-up’ to encourage their friends, families and acquaintances to participate in the survey. Parish priests, the occasional Bishop, doctors in the local dispensaries and the civic guards were also enlisted to help in securing ‘volunteers’. Police sergeants enlisted their forces to round up men in the village or town for measurement, with the instruction that ‘The sergeant wants to see you.’ The guards themselves were measured. Men were measured in the guards’ barracks, school houses, shops and public houses, in farm houses and labourers’ cottages, wherever men were gathered on the bog and in fields, on the quays, lumber yards, in factories and mills, town halls, dispensary doctors’ offices, county courthouses and old people’s homes. In his historical sketch of the survey, which proceeds from county to county, Dupertuis wrote that university students in Galway, as well as soldiers in the army barracks and a number of monks agreed to be measured, as did attendants in mental hospitals and government officials (Hooton et al. 1955).

Dawson provides a lively account of the process of securing women ‘volunteers’ in a letter to Hooton. Having given up the idea of bicycling around the western seaboard with Leica camera and callipers, ‘as the weather, road and distances were just impossible’, she bought a Ford car. But other challenges were more intractable.

I am having quite a lot of difficulty in getting the women too - they are so very shy and suspicious of me. Most of them think I am Irish (they say I ‘don’t talk like a Yank’) and as a result the older women think I’m some official around getting data that will result in them losing their old age pensions! You can imagine how popular that makes me. Then the younger girls think I am looking for nurses to send to Abysinnia. So it really taxes
my powers of persuasion - to say nothing of the strain it’s been on my patience and sense of humour.\textsuperscript{20}

The largest series of measurements consisted of 1,114 men who came from Clare. The reason for the heavy concentration from Clare was that the county had been chosen as the site for observational work by the Harvard social anthropologists. Dupertuis wrote,

The original plan was to correlate their findings with those from the anthropometric survey. Subsequently however, it was found impractical to carry out this proposal. The result was that Clare was more thoroughly covered than any other county in Ireland (Hooton \textit{et al.} 1955: 9).

Though Hooton, Dupertuis and Dawson worked on the Irish material up to December 1941, the results of the work of the ‘Racial Survey of Ireland’ were not published until 1955, some twenty years after the data was collected. In relating early findings of the Racial Survey to a correspondent, Hooton writes

\text{... It is suggested by a preliminary survey of the material, that the Irish represent a fairly complicated race mixture. Undoubtedly there is at least one tall, dark, long-headed strain surviving from the Old Stone Age. There is also a probably shorter, dark haired, round-headed element which may have come in during the Bronze Age. In the eastern coast there is concentrated a smaller, dark-haired long-headed population which may have been responsible for the introduction of the megalithic monuments. The Central Plain has been occupied to a great extent by blond, long-headed Nordics, most of whom perhaps came in during Viking times. Certainly all of these stocks have intermingled, and I quite agree with you that as this process of intermixture continued it has produced the unusual combination of qualities which we think of as Irish.}\textsuperscript{21}

The physical anthropology survey of adult Irish men and women used cranial measurements to discern racial types on the island of Ireland. Hooton collaborated with the Archaeological strand in the preparation of published excavations accounts, particularly in the measurement and analysis of human skeletal remains in the excavations of burial places (see for example Hencken and Movius 1934: 258). From such measurement data, conclusions about


\textsuperscript{21}Hooton to De Sayda, September 18th 1939, Box 13.24, Correspondence Hooton-Dawson/Dupertuis, The Hooton Papers, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.
racial differences were made. In examining the published accounts of the archaeological excavations, the interconnections or 'correlations' between the 'Racial Survey' and the 'Archaeological Survey' can begin to be discerned.\textsuperscript{22} Plans were also made to correlate the specifically Clare data with the findings of the social anthropologists in the county, though these remained unfulfilled.

\textit{Hencken, Movius and the Harvard Irish Archaeological Survey}

The Harvard Archaeological Survey commenced in Ireland in the summer of 1932 and at least seventeen archaeological sites were examined in the five-year period until 1936 (see Gosling and Byrne, n.d.). As far as we can discern, of the three strands, it was the Archaeological strand which had a presence in Ireland in all five years, though excavations themselves were sometimes of a relatively short duration, from three to six weeks. The Archaeological work was directed by Hugh O'Neill Hencken (1902-1981) and Hallam L. Movius Jnr. (1907-1987), and were carried out with the assistance of Irish professional archaeologists, government officials, National Museum employees as well as the physical labour of Ireland’s unemployed.

Sites, north and south, were excavated, two of which were in the Burren district of Clare, Cahercommaun near Carron and Poulawack near Poulnabrone (Hencken 1935, 1938). Excavations included burial mounds, crannógs, settlements, middens and a cliff fort. The Harvard Archaeological Survey received the support of Adolf Mahr who was first approached by Hencken in 1931 for permission to carry out excavations on Irish sites. Henken provides an account of the early communications between the Americans and Irish.

In the Summer of 1932 the Archaeological Mission of the Harvard Irish Survey did its first season’s work in Ireland...Very fortunately it has been made possible for the Archaeological Mission to conduct its work under the auspices of the Irish Antiquities Division of the National Museum of Ireland, of which Dr. Adolf Mahr is Keeper. He and his colleagues have placed at our disposal all the facilities of the National Museum, with the happy result that the spirit of co-operation essential to the success of the project has been pleasantly established. According to the National

\textsuperscript{22} For example, in a collaborative analysis with Hooton, of human bones found in a cairn, Movius points to a racial difference between those who inhumed their dead and those who cremated their dead. See Hencken and Movius (1934), p.283.
Monuments Act (1930) systematic excavations are subject to inspection by the Keeper of Irish Antiquities and the visits which the Keeper has made to this and other sites have served to strengthen this co-operative spirit. It is the policy of Harvard University that the objects found during excavations should become the property of the National Museum of Ireland (Hencken and Movius 1934: 232).

Mahr also provides an account of the American approach to the Museum.

...The opportunity to make a fresh start offered itself when our member, Dr H. O'Neill Hencken, in 1931, approached the National Museum on behalf of Harvard University, as to the possibility of excavating at Harvard's expense, on Irish sites, it being carefully understood from the outset that Harvard was interested in the scientific results only, and not in the acquisition of finds for themselves. This offer was, very naturally, accepted with alacrity by all concerned and in 1932 the 'Harvard University Archaeological Mission to Ireland' started work (Mahr 1937: 268).

Some controversy did ensue however, with representatives of both professional and amateur archaeologists expressing concern over the methods and the purpose of the Survey. For example, Rev. L. Murray, editor of the County Louth Archaeological Journal, criticised the methodological and theoretical approach of the archaeological work, casting doubt on the kinds of general scientific statements that could be made from bone measuring and examining tomb remains. While describing the excavation of the Bronze Age burial site in precise detail, the first half of Murray's article conveys his scepticism and criticism of the Survey, particularly because of perceived damage to monuments and the exhumation of the bones of the dead.

While we are intensely interested in the discoveries resulting from the wholesale campaign of excavation of ancient monuments which—mostly under foreign supervision— is at present taking place in the Free State, we must confess that we are out of sympathy with some of the methods. In spite of the flourish of trumpets with which each new 'discovery' is being greeted in the daily press, we doubt if the country's gain is commensurate with its loss. We refer, in particular, to the disturbance of ancient burial grounds, the measuring out of bones in pints and quarts, and the shipping to Dublin or foreign countries of boxes of skeletons in order to determine measurements such as the sub-trochanteric and nutritive-foramen diameters, the cranial, humero-femoral and tibia-femoral indices etc., etc. (Murray 1933: 65).

Murray noted that local beliefs which associated ill-luck with disturbing the homes of the dead did much to protect Ireland's ancient monuments from
injury and amateur excavation, but that the example set by the Harvard Survey, that is ‘the rather ghoulish performances referred to above will blunt the susceptibilities of the ordinary people, and, thereby, hasten the work of destruction’ (Murray 1933: 65).

The majority view of the Harvard-Archaeological Survey was that it was beneficial for Irish archaeology, in providing practical examples and experience of new fieldwork methodologies and in publication of excavations. Mahr (1937) viewed the Survey as a ‘fillip’ to Irish archaeology which would gain scientific evidence, and a training ground in field techniques for local archaeologists, as well as generating public interest and motivation for subsequent Irish programmes of work. More recently, M.J. O’Kelly (Professor of Archaeology at University College Cork), wrote that

...a magnificent example was set for the then few budding Irish archaeologists and for those who have since carried forward the torch of Irish archaeology. The work and publications of Hencken and Movius and the specialist reports of many others contained in appendices to those publications are constantly referred to by all of us who work in Irish archaeology to-day, and while radiocarbon and much new knowledge have rather altered the 1930s picture presented by the Harvard Mission, we are all fully conscious of the debt we owe to Hugh O’Neill Hencken (Daniel 1982: 6).

In 1934, as a result of the Survey, under a state-financed scheme for the relief of unemployment, large sums of money became available to pay for labour for excavations.\(^23\) The excavation work and publications of the Harvard Archaeological Survey in Ireland is regarded as marking the ‘birth’ of the professionalisation of Irish archaeology.

**Warner, Arensberg, Kimball and the Harvard Irish Social Anthropology Survey**

The Social Anthropology strand of the Harvard Irish Study was carried out by Conrad Arensberg (1910-1997) and Solon Kimball (1909-1982), under the direction of William Lloyd Warner (1898-1970). Warner also had overall

\(^23\) In a footnote, Mahr writes ‘From 1934, the Free State Government financially subsidised certain aspects of the whole enterprise, notably in defraying the labour-expenses on some of the major excavations. Harvard, however, financed its supervisors expenses throughout, and to the very end conducted also excavations which were entirely a Harvard responsibility. The same applies to Harvard excavations in the Six Counties’ (Mahr 1937: 268).
responsibility for the three strands of the Harvard-Survey in Ireland. To him fell the task of building ‘diplomatic relations’ and making contacts to ease the way of the Survey in the country. Warner’s influence in devising and supporting the Social Anthropology strand, and his influence in the design and field work approach of *Family and Community in Ireland*, is extensive.

Early in his career, Warner was influenced by Bronislaw Malinowski and A. R. Radcliffe Browne (who became his tutor) of the British school of Social Anthropology. He had spent three years in Australia studying the Murngin people (Warner 1930). In 1929, he was appointed Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Harvard and with the assistance of Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School began a series of community based studies in Newburyport, Massachusetts. These became known as the Yankee City studies. Warner’s work was designed to reveal the ‘social system of a community’ and in this study he identified and described the operation of an American social class system. In these years he was also interested in research methods for the investigation of whole communities and in developing field-work techniques in these settings. He argued that the main focus for community studies should be based not on individual lives or events but rather on the relationship between individuals. He wrote,

> If the basic unit of analysis is the relation rather than the individual, then it should be possible in a community research to connect any given relation with all others and thereby construct an interconnected, interdependent system of total interaction (in Kimball 1979: 793).

Warner’s desire was to develop a research framework which would permit the researcher to see ‘society as a total system of interdependent, inter-related statuses’, an objective which was realised, he claimed, in the Yankee City study. The study itself was reported in five monographs, reflecting distinct research areas: *The Social Life of a Modern Community, The Status System of a Modern Community, The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups, The Social System of the Modern Factory* and *The Living and the Dead*. Dissatisfied with the classical methods and approach of American and European anthropologists who observed ‘exotic peoples’ in distant civilisations and cultures, Warner and his colleagues, through the Yankee City study, sought to seek the legitimacy of a ‘social anthropology’ located in the
‘New World’ with a focus on urban settings in modernising, industrial societies.\(^{24}\) From the beginning of the twentieth century until the 1960s, in the US, social anthropology or ethnography became associated with community studies and the ethnographies of American immigrants.\(^{25}\)

In the Preface to *Family and Community in Ireland*, Warner described the limits of anthropology traditionally defined as the study of primitive societies, limits not observed by the sister disciplines of physical anthropology and archaeology which included a modern dimension. Interested in making comparisons between modern and traditional societies, in categorising cultures along a continuum which ranged from ‘simple’ to ‘complex’ and in making universal generalisations about human behaviour, Warner was part of a movement to lift anthropology out of its narrow but deeply descriptive focus, enmeshed in colonial and Christian values. Warner and others brought to American anthropology the ideas of European social scientists such as Emile Durkheim, for example, who argued for a rigorous and objective methodological approach to the work of investigating human society. Warner wrote that for the full grown comparative social science of man, the communities of modern life must be included among those studied by anthropologists. If this means that the subject matter of ethnology is the same as that of sociology, so much the better. Anthropologists may then make effective use of sociological methods, sociologists of anthropological ones (Warner 1939: xiii).

\(^{24}\)The publication of *Middletown* in 1929, a church-sponsored study of a ‘typical American Community’ by a Protestant Minister, Robert Lynd (1892-1970) and his wife Helen Lynd (Merrell) (1894-1982), to investigate the impact of industrialisation on Christian morality became a reference point for this approach, as was the follow-up study, *Middletown in Transition* (1937), also by Robert Lynd and Helen Lynd. The theme of kinship and family is strong in these studies. Viddich and Lynam (2000) note that *Middletown in Transition* would become a standard and much praised work of sociological ethnography for the next half century. At Columbia University, where Robert Lynd taught generations of students, ‘explicitly Christian values and rhetoric were replaced by those of an ethically inclined political radicalism’ (Viddich and Lynam 2000: 49).

\(^{25}\)From the 1920s to the 1960s, the influence of the members of the Sociology Department at the University of Chicago, such as Robert Park and Earnest Burgess, can also be felt in developing a research base for urban ethnographies of diverse, immigrant communities as well as those of urban dissidents, deviants, gang-members, the suicidal, drug-addicted and mentally disturbed (see Viddich and Lynam 2000: 50-53). See this account for a concise and critical overview of the history and development of anthropology in the US. For a recent account of the interest of American anthropology in Europe as well as a review of the development of Irish Anthropology, see Wilson (1997).
Warner's interest in a comparative social anthropology was to lead him directly from Newburyport and the Yankee City project to Ireland and Clare, a modernising country on the periphery of Europe, caught between ‘Old World’ tradition and the imperatives of ‘New World’ developments. Warner held the post of Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago from 1935-41, Professor from 1941-59, at which point he joined Michigan State University as Professor of Social Research. He was also the founder in 1946 of Social Research Inc., a Chicago based consulting and research firm to which he served as advisor until his death in 1970.

Throughout his career, Warner utilised an approach to the study of community which emphasised communities as interconnected sub-systems consisting of various institutions (such as religion), each of which served particular functions in maintaining that system and social order. He argued that his scheme of research, a functional approach to the study of community, could be applied to any community in any setting, in a modern or a ‘simple’ society, thus laying the foundation for methods of research unknown to anthropology at the time and a basis for a comparative sociology. His field work techniques, guidelines for observing community structures, patterns and interactions, are explained in an account of the rationale and purpose of the Newburyport study, one of the few detailed descriptions of the methods anthropologists used in their work at that time (Warner 1941).

Warner emphasised that a distinctive organising theme could be discerned for different types of communities, explaining the status, behaviour, privileges and obligations of any individual within the system. For example, he argued that kinship was the dominant structure among the Murngin in Australia and that social class (with social mobility) were the most significant organising structures in the Yankee City study. These dominant themes provided a focus for fieldwork and the interpretation of observations. In writing about Warner’s intellectual work, Kimball acknowledged that the ‘Warnerian approach’ provoked adherents and critics but that it had the merit of being applicable ‘to such diverse societies as the Murngin, Yankee City, the Deep South, Ireland, Jonesville or an emergent national community’ (Kimball 1979: 795). Clearly, Warner’s intention to devise new theoretical approaches and methods for studying communities in a comparative context, whether
situated in the Old World or the New, including literate and pre-literate peoples, provided a rationale for Warner’s early research interests. For example, the Yankee City study, part of which continued at the same time as the field work for the Harvard Irish Study, led him to Ireland, specifically to complete a comparative field study of the Irish in the Old World, one of the Yankee City ethnic groups observed in the New World (Henderson and Wrigley 1994: 20).

Warner’s influence on the design of the Social Anthropology strand of the Harvard Irish Study can be discerned from his interest in community and in identifying a dominant theme in a research setting to guide fieldwork and data analysis. But his influence extends also to his choice of fieldworkers: both Conrad Arensberg and Solon Kimball had worked on the Newburyport/Yankee City study. Arensberg was a young undergraduate field worker and interpreter in the study of ethnic communities in Newburyport. Kimball also had spent a period of one to two years in the field, learning the ‘community study method’ and gathering data. When Arensberg worked on the Newburyport/Yankee City project he met many ethnic Irish. Kimball, although mainly occupied with the study of schooling, also worked on the Irish aspect of the Newburyport/Yankee City project. Both graduate students were to find material for the first community study of their own (a necessary part of anthropological training at the time) and material for their doctoral theses, to be supervised by Warner, in joining the Social Anthropology Survey of the Harvard Irish Study.  

Sol Kimball and Connie Arensberg were to become life-long friends and collaborators. In later life they were to publish, along with Family and Community in Ireland, on methodological and theoretical issues that helped introduce ‘a substantially new anthropology, a comparative field-based science that could contribute significantly to the interdisciplinary study of

26 The title of Arensberg’s PhD dissertation is A Study of Rural Life in Ireland as Determined by the Functions and Morphology of the Family (1934), Harvard University. Warner’s influence is evident in the title. Kimball’s PhD dissertation is titled The Tradesman and his Family in the Economic Structure of an Irish Town, (1936), Harvard University. There is an interesting note attached to Arensberg’s thesis bibliography to the effect that he could not source any material on Irish sociology, indicating the absence of sociology (or anthropology)
Modern European and North American Societies' (Comitas 1999: 811). Arensberg and Kimball devised a new paradigm for studying culture and community which had far-reaching effects. Of their lifetime collaboration and partnership, Arensberg wrote,

Sol and I were graduate students together from 1932 to 1936. We did our PhD researches with shared field work in Ireland. We wrote articles and books together, continuing over thirty years’ intermittent co-authorship. Ours was a colleagueship that went on and on over the years and over the hopes of building a natural science of human behaviour and interactions in culture and society. It was also a friendship and comradeship of mutual affection and respect that filled the heart for fifty years. The scholarship and authorship it entailed you can find in his and my bibliographies. It will be up to others to judge what contribution it has meant (Arensberg 1983: 7).

Conrad Maynadier Arensberg was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1912), the eldest of four sons. His father was an attorney, of German/English background, while his grandfather was a steel manufacturer and banker. His mother, Emily Wright Maynadier Arensberg, was of French Hugenot ancestry; her family migrated to the American South in 1688. The Maynadier farms by the Chesapeake, in which Connie Arensberg lived for some time, were large and substantial. Arensberg was remembered as ‘a quiet, bookish child, not favoured with good looks, and keenly embarrassed by a stammer’ who subsequently developed as the exceptional sibling and was considered a ‘near prodigy’ (Comitas 1999: 810). Arensberg studied Anthropology at Harvard (1927-1931) from which he graduated with a BA (*summa cum laude*). As mentioned above, while a Harvard senior, he worked on the Yankee City project with Warner until the time he graduated. Warner did not have the funds to continue the employment of Arensberg, who, having won a scholarship to read law at Trinity College, Cambridge, England, began to study law, the family profession, in late 1931. By early 1932, however, Warner was successful in securing additional funding ‘to do the comparative field study of Yankee City ethnic groups, such as the Irish, in the Old World’, and

---

27The biographical information on Arensberg here is taken from a number of sources, including Henderson and Wrigley (1994), Comitas (1997, 1999), and personal communication with Vivian Garrison Arensberg (Feb-May 2001).
offered the job to Arensberg, who quickly left his legal studies to begin his career as an anthropologist.\textsuperscript{28}

Arensberg secured his first academic appointment as Assistant Professor in the Department of Social Sciences and Economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1937, moving to Brooklyn College of the City University of New York in 1942 where he served as Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. During the Second World War he held the rank of Captain in the US Army, leaving military service with the rank of Major in 1946. Arensberg served in the Military Intelligence Service of the Special Branch, travelling overseas with the Strategic Bombing Survey in Japan. Returning to New York in 1946, he became Chairman of the Sociology Department at Barnard College. There he stayed until 1952 when he joined the Department of Anthropology at Columbia University. Arensberg remained in Columbia until his formal retirement as Professor Emeritus in 1979. Reflecting on his ‘modest demeanour’ and ‘powerhouse impact’ at Columbia, Carol Henderson recalls a man considered by all who met him as thoughtful, considerate and gentlemanly, extending his concern and interest to a multitude of students (Henderson 1994: 19).

Raised in Manhatten in the state of Kansas, Sol Kimball moved to Harvard for his postgraduate work. He has been described as a ‘profoundly optimistic person’, possessing ‘tremendous personal energy and infectious enthusiasm’ (Moore 1984: 389). After his period in Ireland, he returned to the US in the era of the 'New Deal', when recovery from the Great Economic Depression was under way. Sol Kimball joined the Soil Conservation Service with the US Department of Agriculture, later transferring to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, beginning a period of work among the Navajo and a life-long interest in applied anthropology.\textsuperscript{29} For the next ten years Kimball worked in applied settings for the US government. From 1942 to 1945 he worked for the Community Organisation section of the War Relocation Authority, travelling extensively to the Japanese internment camps throughout the US. He joined Michigan State University as Associate Professor (1945-1948), then moved to

\textsuperscript{28}Arensberg was awarded the Sheldon Fellowship for study and travel in Europe for the period 1931-1932. Solon Kimball was also funded for his work in Ireland by the Sheldon Fellowship, 1933-1934.
the University of Alabama, before becoming Professor of Anthropology and Education in the Department of Philosophy and Social Science at Teachers College, Columbia, where he worked for thirteen years. In 1966, he became graduate research Professor of Anthropology at the University of Florida. Kimball became especially renowned, not only for his intellectual contributions to American Applied Anthropology, but also as a 'wonderfully gifted teacher' who demanded much from his students. William Partridge, one such student, describes him as having an 'optimistic personality, accepting the challenge (of creating new knowledge) due to a faith in his own and his student's abilities to meet it. His was a rigorous intellect' (Partridge 1983: 13). Partridge remembers, in particular, Kimball’s commitment to ideas and teaching.

His advice is to remember the sensitivity and delicacy of the balance of relationships that are crucial to our life as humans, to respect those balances, and to continue to do careful, painstaking serious research directed at answering basic questions. In these admonitions we find a clue to the power of the natural history approach - an approach that permits the full range of inquiry into group and community life, allowing us to ask the difficult questions about the nature of culture, the assignment of meaning, the arrangement of humans into categories and groups, and the processes of change over time (Partridge 1983: 22).

Kimball’s early experiences of working in a multidisciplinary and team setting in the US and Ireland, resulting in his first major publication with his colleague Arensberg, were to influence his teaching and research for the rest of his life (Moore 1984).

*Negotiating the Research Setting*

While Hooton was responsible for the general co-ordination and financial management of the Harvard Irish Study, it fell to Lloyd Warner to manage the public and diplomatic relations for the three strands of the Irish study. A large press campaign was engaged in on both sides of the Atlantic, featuring reports of archaeological excavations and finds as well as interviews with members of the social anthropology survey. The Harvard team were much concerned about the local reception of the study. It was assumed that the archaeological
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29Information on Kimball’s career is taken here from Moore (1984).
strand would be least problematic and the physical anthropology the most problematic. But it was the former that caused most disquiet among the Irish archaeological community, anxious about the activities of the Harvard archaeologists in Ireland. Posters and press releases were issued to reassure the Irish about the nature and objective of the archaeological survey, stressing how the aim was to collect data for scientific purposes rather than to find and keep material artefacts. This press campaign, though initiated by the Harvard Irish Study, also received the support of members of the National Museum, especially Adolf Mahr. While the Harvard Team were somewhat concerned not to release too much information about the study into the public domain, Warner was keen to generate ‘the right kind of propaganda among the Irish people’ so that the work of the study could proceed uninterrupted.

In order to deflect any further criticism of the Harvard Irish Study and to prepare the local people for the arrival of the physical and social anthropologists, Warner arranged an interview with Éamon de Valera, the leader of Fianna Fáil and head of the Irish Free State Government. The interview, according to Warner,

...turned out, as far as I can see, most successfully. I had a fairly long talk with him in his offices and found him a very fine man who is intelligent and grasped what I was talking about immediately. He offered several suggestions, among them a possibility of digging a site a little south of County Clare in Limerick. He also asked me to write a brief resume of our project and to write a letter addressed to myself which was to be signed by him as an endorsement of our project.

By September 1932, Warner had secured a letter of introduction from de Valera. This, however, he had to use with discretion. The permission of Bishop Fogarty of Killaloe, who was not a supporter of de Valera, also had to be sought so that the social anthropological work in Clare could proceed. Clearly, Warner’s considerable diplomatic skills were called upon in negotiating the goodwill of both politician and prelate.

---

I got the letter I wanted from de Valera signed on official stationery, and I have used it in the proper quarters and kept it out of sight in other places. I had a long talk with the Bishop some time back and found him a very agreeable and nice person. He is a violent antagonist of de Valera's and it is rather difficult to talk to him since he persists in discussing politics, and one does not like to be too agreeable with some of the remarks made by him since they are likely to be repeated, but on the other hand one does not want to appear as pro de Valera in the eyes of the Bishop. I think though that the interview was successful.32

Warner also confided to Hooton that ‘one of the most expensive parts of the research up to now has been the buying of the wine of the country for our various informants.’33

In writing about their research, Kimball recalls Warner’s preliminary preparations for the Harvard Irish Study.

Warner had gone to Ireland in the Summer of 1931 to explore possibilities and to make preliminary arrangements. There his warm and considerate style of engaging others, his enthusiasm for the project, and undoubtedly some of the prestige of Harvard permitted him to win approval from high sources. In his interview with Éamon de Valera, Prime Minister of Ireland, he not only obtained approval of the proposed research but also many suggestions for areas of study, people who might be helpful, and situations to avoid. De Valera also arranged an interview with the Roman Catholic Cardinal, whose ‘blessing’ was essential in a land where the thought and practices of the people were so deeply interwoven with the organization and doctrine of Roman Catholicism and where, for most of the population, peoplehood and religion were inseparable. Throughout the subsequent history of the research, it was standard procedure to acquaint local religious and political authorities with the objectives of the research and to enlist their support. In no instance was such a request ever denied and there were many among the Irish whose assistance was invaluable.34

Of equal significance were the contacts established by Arensberg with academics such as Professors George O’Brien and Eoin MacNeil of the National University of Ireland and Séamus Ó Duillearga of the Irish Folklore

Commission. These men were instrumental in instructing Arensberg in the social, economic and political history of Ireland, with particular reference to agrarian politics and land reform. Ó Duillearga’s association with the Harvard team extended throughout the duration of the study: he was invited by the Department of Anthropology to provide a series of lectures at Harvard University on Irish Folklore in 1939. Arensberg also made a particular friend of Patrick Meghen, a civil servant of some significance and influence. In a letter to Hooton, reporting on the progress of the anthropology survey in summer 1932, Warner writes of how Arensberg was perceived and of the importance of the contacts Arensberg had developed.

Both O’Brien and Delargy (sic) informed me that they believe that Connie had a better rounded-out knowledge of Ireland than anyone they knew and that he spent most of his time on his research. It was obvious in their relations with him that they thought very highly of him. I also discovered that he made a great number of contacts which have proved invaluable in the work we are doing at the present time... Connie and I came down to Ennis with the Town Commissioner, who took us about the town and introduced us to everyone of consequence in the place... I discovered that Meeghan (sic), the Town Commissioner here, is a person who is one of the most popular men in Clare and has been instrumental in making it possible for us to start work immediately on the very things that would have taken us months ordinarily to have accomplished and did in Newburyport. At the present time I have a number of the private documents of the city government in my room for transcription into our records. Meeghan, incidentally, was a find of Connie’s.

It was crucial that the Harvard Irish Study establish contacts with powerful informants on both sides of the civil war (1922-1923) split in Ireland in the early years of the 1930s. That success attended Warner’s efforts is clear from his description of a train journey from Dublin to Ennis in the summer of 1932.

I forgot to say that when Connie and I came down to Ennis with Meeghan we were in an observation car alone with all the senators and members of the Dail from County Clare, and we had from four to five hours of conversation with them which will help immensely since they all offered their help in any way in which they could be of service. This is particularly

---

35 Arensberg dedicated *The Irish Countryman* (1937) to Patrick Meghen and Lloyd Warner, ‘Good companions, philosophers, and friends, interpreters each of his own country and of his fellow men’.

satisfying since members of both parties were in the group. There is no question now about our having any difficulties at all in the sociological end of our research providing we have enough intelligence to understand the data we collect.\textsuperscript{37}

Arensberg also had to represent the interests of the Harvard Irish Study at national level. He was invited to speak at a state function about the study and was instructed, from America, how to respond by Hooton and Warner.

I am sure that you will handle the situation at the dinner very well. Neither Lloyd nor I felt that it was possible to side-step this function. We can be quiet about our sociological work in Ireland as long as the Irish do not demand a public statement from us. Upon such a demand, we must deliver, hoping that we shall not offend anyone.\textsuperscript{38}

Doing research is intrusive at the best of times and the probability of avoiding causing offence is very slight. Certainly the Harvard Irish Study team were sensitive to national as well as local conditions as is evident in their efforts to secure the approval for their work from the highest political and religious leaders in the land. Whether this has had implications for what was not studied or was not reported, remains a matter of some debate. What is certain is that Arensberg and Kimball stayed in Clare for various periods of time from 1932 until 1934. Here they first studied the markets and systems of exchange and distribution in Ennis, followed by periods of observation in the rural communities of Luogh and Rynamona.

Family and Community in Ireland: The Study Unfolds
In the summer of 1931, on behalf of the Harvard Irish Study, Warner came to Ireland to make a preliminary survey of the 26 counties of the Irish Free State, gathering data on the social and economic conditions of the country. Whether he managed to visit each county in such a short period is doubtful, but Warner seemed to have the talent and personal disposition for making the appropriate overtures and connections with those in powerful places, who were then disposed to facilitate him and provide him and the Harvard Study with an entrance into Irish society. Warner recommended to Hooton that Clare should

be selected as the main site for a detailed study of Irish society, the county being representative ‘in microcosm’ of Ireland as a whole. Kimball has left a record of the formal criteria which were used in the selection of Clare as a research site for the social anthropological work. Clare was also a Fianna Fáil stronghold (de Valera represented the county in parliament) and a location frequented by national and international scholars, writers and artists. Securing letters of introduction from powerful people and recruiting the support of local contacts and willing informants in Clare is not described (or even mentioned) in *Family and Community in Ireland*. Clearly the public presentation of the background work necessary to the research process was not a feature of anthropological writing in the 1930s.

There is considerable diversity within Ireland in the relative distribution of population in relation to urban or rural residence, industrial development, occupation, distribution of resources, religion, native speech, political affiliation and the like. The objective was to select a county which was broadly representative of the demographic and social characteristics of the country as a whole. In his selection process Warner made intensive use of the recently published 1926 census of the Irish Free State. His criteria yielded County Clare on the west coast, with a small but flourishing county seat of Ennis, as a county presenting a balanced mixture of demographic and social criteria. Clare was a blend of Gaelic and modern British influences with a proportionately large number of small holders, mostly in the west, a clustering of larger farms to the east, and scattered large estates. Its people also lived in medium sized towns, small villages and hamlets, the port town of Kilrush, and resort towns along the coast. There were a few pockets of native Gaelic speakers in the west, while a handful of Church of Ireland adherents and chapel dissenters lived peaceably in a sea of Catholic dominance and toleration.  

Arensberg, arriving in Ireland in February 1932, passed the first part of the year immersed in the study of Irish history, politics, literature, folklore and economic affairs. Utilising published and official sources he also made contacts with government representatives, state officials, civil servants and scholars, to guide his way. During this time Arensberg took courses in Trinity College Dublin as well as visiting Europe and Morocco and studying Arabic.

---


In the summer of 1932, Connie Arensberg and Lloyd Warner ‘settled in Clare’ to commence the collection of the ethnographic data later to be reported in *The Irish Countryman* and *Family and Community in Ireland*. Though in the Preface to that work, Warner states that Arensberg and Kimball ‘continued their field work for a period of almost two years,’ this may amount to the combined total number of months spent travelling in Ireland, studying aspects of Irish society, rather than the length of fieldwork in Clare. From February 1932 Arensberg spent at least ten months in Clare, returning to Harvard in the late summer of 1933 to make a preliminary study of his data. Back in Harvard he wrote his doctoral dissertation, which was accepted in 1934. He later returned to Ireland, spending some time in Clare, Belfast and Dublin between December 1934 and January 1935.

Kimball did not arrive in Clare until later in 1933, delayed by his ‘training’ work on the Yankee City study. Kimball remained in Clare until May 1934, he and Arensberg corresponding by letter during this time.\(^40\) In a video interview with Lambros Comitas, Arensberg describes Kimball as his ‘successor’ in the field.\(^41\) From the sources available to us, there is no evidence that Arensberg and Kimball were working in Clare at the same time, apart from the one short period of overlap in 1933. Arensberg has written about this period and his impressions of Kimball.

Two years later the monumental field work of Yankee City was moving to the first of its five volumes and a new scheme was brewing. That was to do a comparative community study in a European culture setting, using anthropological method. The setting chosen was Ireland, conveniently English speaking in great part, but with a brogue. Kimball and I were ready, our Yankee City parts done or turned over to others. I went there first and spent a year in County Clare. Sol came over at the end of that, to join me and then to continue on his own. He arrived by boat from Boston, debarking at the ancient West-of-Ireland city of Galway, making a first landing in Europe about like a man’s coming to the USA for the first time through Fairbanks Alaska. It was years before he saw the more ‘normal’ rest of Europe with its Paris, London or Rome.

---

\(^40\) Kimball Papers, Box 6A, p3. Special Collections, Milbank Memorial Library, Teachers College, Columbia University.

\(^41\) Personal communication Vivian Garrison Arensberg with Anne Byrne, February 2001.

Sol was a consummate field worker, immersing himself in the ways and concerns of his ‘natives’. We wrote our theses and books out of our times there and with the kind help of so many lovely Irish people, male and female, young and old. My writings were about the small farmers (‘peasantry’ is a continental word, not the Irish one) and Sol’s about the townsfolk. I have two memories of the time which testify to Sol’s immersion. One is simple: when he came home to Boston from Galway, again a ‘native’ back-route, I met him at the boat. But I nearly failed to recognise my colleague and friend. A thick moustache, a shaggy Donegal tweed coat and a brogue as thick as the lilting Gaelic language itself, showed me a new Irish man little like the Kansan of before.

The other memory is Sol’s fateful encounter with the *sidhe* (the fairies and the ghosts). Many years before, a Black and Tan soldier (that is a member of the British Army which had fought the Irish moving towards independence during and after the first World War) had been killed on the steps of the country hotel in the little town of Ennis, where Sol stayed. Now some twenty years later, Sol came home from a lively evening (one of many) of talk, song, drink and stories. He came to the door of the hotel in the dark of the rainy and unlit street. He saw a shadow moving at the door which then made its way through it. Agitated, Kimball went inside, and at the bar he spoke of it and inquired about it. Silence and uneasiness greeted him - no one answered him. But next day Sol was ‘in’, an accepted native of the town. He had seen the well known but never mentioned soldier, the supernatural (Arensberg 1983: 8-9).

Mildred Warner’s account of her stay in Ennis in the summer of 1932 is full of rich detail, giving a sense of the collective effort that made the anthropological work of the Harvard Irish Study possible.

Our headquarters were in the Queen’s Hotel where Lloyd had engaged rooms for Connie Arensberg and for us, with an extra room to serve as an office. Since the Queen’s was a favourite of the County people we expected that the food would be quite good... Connie studied the market and I did the statistical work on his reports... A good researcher, Connie joined in the customs of the country and had drinks with the men beginning when they arrived at market carrying on from there. He often treated and learned, almost too late, that it was the custom for the person buying the first drink to buy the last. He had unwittingly been prolonging sessions at the bar...

Their local contacts included the parish priest,

... a big man, young and jovial, much loved by his congregation. He took Lloyd around the parish, introducing him and making for us most effective contacts. He also took us to the mother superior of the local convent, who invited us to morning tea, took us to a classroom to observe teaching, and then dismissed school in our honor... The previous Summer Lloyd had made contact with Patrick Meghen, of the Irish Civil Service, assigned to
Ennis as a special administrator to supervise fiscal affairs which the local politicians had put in a somewhat chaotic state. Through him we made a great variety of contacts. A nurse at the county mental institution invited us to visit it with her. Ireland had a low crime rate and a high rate of mental illness... Most of those we saw were in a large room, in wooden chairs along the wall; some more ill were seated around a table in the center of the room, each chained by the ankle to the floor.42

After returning to New York for a brief period after his sojourn in Ireland with the Warners, Arensberg set out for Ireland again in November 1932, arriving in Dublin. Arensberg’s objective in Ireland was two-fold: to work as a researcher on the Harvard Irish Study and to engage in observational field work that would provide data for his PhD thesis. In relating his thoughts on his first week in Dublin he recalls them in a letter to his then girlfriend, Peggy.43

I had a very pleasant week in Dublin but I don’t know how profitable it was for the start point of the job I am supposed to do here. Nevertheless it was filled with a great variety of calls upon people. It seems I already have quite a connection here and the traditional Irish hospitality doesn’t fail. I saw two professors, three civil servants, a judge, a doctor, a student, lots of them, some fox hunting aristocrats, some stout-drinking democrats and the United States chargé d’affaires.44

Arensberg also complains about the immensity of his research task and the taxing role that he must adopt when meeting people who will introduce him to Irish culture.

I’ve just so damned much to do and to remember and record, and also got so much acting and playing the interested intelligent inquirer and the authoritative scholar that I have little time for relaxation... It is impossible to have a conversation with anyone without whiskey, and if I’ve got to fight off the effects of whiskey is addition to all this... Christ! I would gladly sink all of the drink in Ireland under the sea. 45


43 This correspondence was kindly made available by Vivian Garrison Arensberg, New York, from her collection of the personal papers of C. M. Arensberg.

44 Arensberg to Walsh November 27 1932, Vivian Garrison Arensberg, Private Collection, New York.

45 Arensberg to Walsh December 21 1932, Vivian Garrison Arensberg, Private Collection, New York.
Having just arrived in Ennis on 21 December, 1932, and staying in the Queen's Hotel, Arensberg continues to describe the task before him to Peggy.

As for me I’m working pretty hard in spite of the approach of Xmas. I’m afraid I described Ennis to you last week a little unfeelingly; for I made no mention of the people in the town. My job here is to live with them, observe them, and work with them - in fact I’m sort of reporter at large with a scientific kink, and it is an engrossing job which keeps me running from high to low among them, from the local bishop, a benign old prelate given to unexpected (and sometimes embarrassing, for his parishioners) political outbursts and the district judge, a clear eyed young puritan, to Danny Burke, labourer and general handyman at fairs, who though he rolls his eyes up to heaven in conversation and is devout enough to be a daily communicant, has an inexhaustible fund of local anecdote, history, scandal and opinion, and to Patsy Mahony, labourer, roisterer, drunkard at times, who makes a living by doing-in countrymen.46

Arensberg’s task, building on the earlier work by Warner, was to prepare the way so that the work of observation among the local people could proceed. Part of this work included explaining the purpose of the Harvard Irish Study and why an ‘American gentleman’ such as himself would want to come and live with the country people in their homes and on their farms. The usual explanation that he provided was that he was ‘searching for the old customs’.

While the general election campaign of 1933 was ‘in full swing’ Arensberg took advantage of this opportunity to initiate conversation with the strangers among whom he was living and from whom he was trying to learn the routines and patterns of their everyday lives. By January 1933, he was confident enough to write

...I feel I have the town and its people worked out pretty well. The great problem is to decide just how deep to burrow, and the fact that I am alone and can only do one job at once has made me feel on occasion that I have missed an opportunity here or there. I want very much to work among the farmers for after all they are our chief concern in an agricultural country. Of course I am skirting them as it were all the time, in working with local government, agricultural and land commission officials, and in watching the markets and fairs, but I haven’t yet actually descended among ‘em. However I am laying a plan of campaign, and hope to carry it out. Only the beastly wet cold of the weather is still just a bit discouraging... I keep myself pretty well absorbed in the work or in expectation as to next steps and the meaning of what I’ve got so far, and on the few occasions when a bit of
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46 Arensberg to Walsh December 21 1932, Vivian Garrison Arensberg, Private Collection, New York.
recreation is needed I’ve the movies and the companionship of the bars, which are sorts of men’s clubs here.\textsuperscript{47}

Arensberg spent the next few months becoming more acquainted with the local clergy, doctors, teachers, legal men, civil servants, Land Commission officials, members of the Garda Síochána and politicians as well as maintaining his connections with Dublin-based academics. By early March 1933 he was ready to set out for north Clare and the district of Lough on his bicycle. In \textit{The Irish Countryman}, he writes about the journey of exploration the social anthropologist must make as his tries to find his way for the first time through the physical landscape and into the lives and minds of the people of a rural community.

I felt Ireland’s fascination as I toiled along behind my bicycle up the mountain road that runs from the narrow valley lands at Doolin in the extreme north west of County Clare. I was on my way to my first stay in an Irish west-country farm community...Lough is remote. It is nearly a half a day's tramp along the roads from it's market town Ennistymon...But Lough is not entirely isolated by this remoteness. It does not entirely escape modernity. Pleasure bent motorists from the cities drive through along the cliffs (Arensberg 1937: 19-20).

Lough, composed of twenty-six farmers’ households, is described by Arensberg as

...like many another community of small farms over Clare and southern and western Ireland. Some lie closer to urban centres, some are even more remote. Many are better off; some few are poorer. Some have kept the Irish language better; others have abandoned it altogether for the brogue... I did not know this as I came to Lough. But I was to learn it soon in Lough and in other communities in County Clare. Later I was to find it even more widely; in newspapers, in novels, in court records, in statistical reports, in political bombasts...My learning was a piecemeal process - a sketching out of wider and wider ramifications of the observations which came my way (Arensberg 1937: 21-22).

Lough is presented as a typical example of an Irish rural community and hence ideal as a location to live in and observe the country people. But it was also a place in which the country people were habituated to strangers and scholars who came to visit and dwell among them. Before the arrival of

\textsuperscript{47}Arensberg to Hooton, January 11, 1933. The Hooton Papers, 995-1, 21-6. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.
Arensberg, staff of the British Broadcasting Corporation had visited and made recordings of old tales and customs from the people of Luogh. Local people were in contact with the National Museum of Ireland, sending archaeological finds such as stone axes and household implements from the ‘olden times’ to Dublin. Séamus Ó Duillearga, a well-known folklorist and founder of the Irish Folklore Commission and editor of Béaloideas, had established relationships with local people in north Clare prepared to give their stories, songs and traditional tales in Irish and English, to the ‘collectors’ of the oral tradition. Indeed Ó Duillearga, whom Arensberg and Kimball credit ‘for paving our way among the country folk’, was influential in the selection of Luogh as an anthropological research site. Arensberg stayed in the same local house as Ó Duillearga, and on the occasion of his first visit to Luogh, the men who arrived to Carty’s house to meet him and those whom he himself sought out were ‘friends’ of Ó Duillearga. The ‘old man’ of the house, Johnnie Carty, a native Irish speaker, gave many stories to Ó Duillearga. Having been hosts to Ó Duillearga and other scholars from Northern Europe interested in old customs and folklore, the Cartys expected Arensberg to behave as Ó Duillearga did. In his diary, Arensberg notes

Rose about 10. Last night in going to bed I was told I ought to be very tired after such a bike ride (way of hinting?). The windows were blinded up so that no light could come in. Told about how Mr Delargy [Ó Duillearga] used to stay up reading and writing, working late, and how he used to sleep out the mornings. On my saying I’d be up probably about 8.00, they said I’d probably find none of the family up. Suggested I get up at 10.00.

In making notes about his first day in Luogh, Arensberg describes the family household with whom he was lodging.

The family consists of old John, called ‘Johnnie’, husband of Mrs Carty (Catherine) whose second wife she is. He has given over the farm to ‘John’ his son and is said to ‘be a great worker for a man of his age’ and to be ‘giving a hand to help his son’... Mrs Carty, Catherine, his wife about 50? (husband is in receipt of old age pension). She is still the woman of the house referred to by others as Catherine or Mrs Carty. She cooks, looks after me, and tends the baby, cleans boots and I hear her voice loudest at

---

48Personal communication, Mary Angela Keane with Anne Byrne, February 2001.
the evening recital of the rosary... The young woman is referred to as ‘the young woman’, is a ‘woman of the Sherrys’ and comes from over by Liscannor’. ‘John’ is her husband, the son. The farm is his, but Mrs Carty, Catherine, takes charge of it inside, woman’s sphere. He does most of the work outside, though aided by his father. Known as a very steady young man. Keeps aloof from his child, the baby, and from his wife, the ‘young woman’ Bridget. The baby is just learning to walk, can’t yet speak (about 18 months old?). Is kept in an open box before the hearth.50

On his first visit to Luogh in the late Spring of 1933, Arensberg felt welcomed and spoke with many people from the district. He was told about christening customs, ties of obligation between relatives, matchmaking and fortunes, the poor price of cattle, funerals, fishing, politics and the IRA. While he spent some time observing young John at his work outdoors, many of his observations concerning domestic and family life began in conversation while in the company of Mrs Carty.

He first began to learn about Luogh and the locality through those whom Ó Duillearga had sought out for him. For example, Ó Duillearga had written to one local man informing him of Connie Arensberg's visit to the locality, requesting his assistance. In his field notes, Arensberg records his first visit to Stephen Hillary.

I came upon a small hut on the edge of the great cliff like escarpment below which Doolin lies. I walked around to the door open (NB two doors to each home, the leeward door was open) and put my head in. An old man, dressed in very ragged and shabby clothes, sat huddled over a small turf fire, whose smoke finding no chimney, filled the house. The house had the basest appearance, though a dilapidated and half empty dresser was there. I introduced myself. Stephen was very glad, had had a letter about me from Delargy, was pleased to see me said he. He was sick and hadn’t got up to Carty’s for some time, not for almost a year since his sight grew bad... He doesn’t get about much. Delargy said I was looking for raths and forts - Stephen would be glad to show them to me some fine day.51

Men came to the Cartys’ house at night to tell Arensberg stories of fairies, of the supernatural and what the country people must do if they had drawn bad luck upon themselves. During the day, he spent some time in the fields

---

observing young John at his work, meeting with people on the road and joining with them in religious observance by attending Mass on a Sunday. On occasion he assisted John in driving cattle from one field to the next. Mrs Carty, though talking to him about family life and who was related to whom, also used the opportunity to ask Arensberg about customs and practices in the US. After spending two weeks in Luogh, he was requested to leave by Mrs Carty as the ‘young woman’ was due her baby soon. The Cartys told him that they would ‘be very lonely after me’ and Arensberg notes that they ‘...paid me the compliment of saying I was just like one of themselves... (they) felt they could make hold on me’.

While working intensively observing the markets and courts of Ennis, and spending shorter periods of time in Luogh and in the surrounding area, both Arensberg and Kimball also observed rural life in Corofin and Rynamona in north Clare for periods during 1933 and 1934. Here they passed days and nights in the homes of John Quinn, ‘old man O’Donoghue’ and with the Moroney family. The description of Rynamona in *The Irish Countryman*, and reproduced in Chapter 10 of *Family and Community in Ireland*, is one which evokes a closely-knit community, in a medium-sized townland of small but fairly prosperous farms, consisting of thirteen households (Arensberg 1937: 127-128). The American anthropologists observed and wrote about the domestic and religious preparations for Christmas, listening to stories of long ago and the ‘hard times’. Stories were told of matchmaking and forward women looking for good husbands, of local politics, the economic war with England and support for de Valera despite all the hardships it entailed. They listened to conversations about illness, death and the quality of priests’ sermons, all the while observing the status of young and old in the community, noting everyday interactions among the country people.

A glimpse of how the American anthropologists were perceived by those whom they visited, talked with, observed and wrote about can be read from a letter written to Connie Arensberg from Mary Ellen Kerin in Ennis in
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December 1976. She exhorts him to come back to the Burren in the summer to ‘check up on the people’ whom he once knew. Mary Ellen writes,

Last week, there were people from Luogh-Doolin in our Bar, visiting the hospital I think, and your name was drawn down in our across-the-counter reminiscences and one man said ‘Do you ever hear from him Miss?’ I said ‘I hear from Solon Kimball.’ So I said ‘I will drop him a wee line at Christmas time.’ ‘Will you tell him Carey is still alive and well? About 80 years old - He knew his father.’ Also last week a Devitt chap was in having a drink (also visiting the Hospital) and he spoke of you both. You stayed with his aunt Mrs Callinan, near Mount Callan, I think. So with these inquiries, I went to the Bookcase and got out *The Irish Countryman*, and I read it at night, all over again. Last year at a summer school in Lahinch, a lecture was given ‘Arensberg and Afterwards’, I would have liked to have been there. So how about ‘Arensberg and the Future’ (as he sees it) and you can’t know anything more about us, unless you come.\(^5^2\)

Sol Kimball stayed in Ireland until May 1934, returning to Harvard to write his dissertation and bring it to completion in 1936. After returning from his fieldwork in Ireland and having received his PhD, Arensberg was appointed a Junior Fellow of Harvard University from 1934 to 1938. During this time, he gave a series of lectures at the Lowell Institute in Boston, which became the basis of *The Irish Countryman* (1937), Arensberg’s first publication drawing on his fieldwork in Ireland. This short book, a prelude to *Family and Community in Ireland*, provides an account of Irish rural ways of life in the 1930s, describing customs, folklore and beliefs, work on the farm, family, kinship, matchmaking, marriage, the connection of the rural family with land, the position of older people in the community and the world of shops, pubs and fairs. A concluding chapter contains an account of religion, fairy-lore and social values. In the preface to the second edition (1968), Arensberg locates *The Irish Countryman* as belonging to that ‘pioneering’ tradition of community studies that included Warner’s Yankee City and Deep South studies, the Lynds’ studies of Middletown (Lynd and Lynd 1929, 1937) and others such as Robert Redfield’s work in Mexico (Redfield 1930). Arensberg wrote that

Community studies, treating the custom and the social behaviour of ways of life both rural and urban, both traditional and modern, have become prime

\(^{52}\)Kerin to Arensberg, December 1 1976, Vivian Garrison Arensberg, Private Collection, New York.
sources of social science data and discovery...The small group of pioneer efforts to use anthropological analysis on the customs, traditions and realities of modern nations, of which The Irish Countryman, as you will see, was one, has grown into a rich literature (Arensberg [1968] 1988: 10-11).

Living in the setting, observing and interpreting modernising and modern communities in the Americas, became the foundation for the practice and development of community studies and method. But writing in 1968, Arensberg considered that The Irish Countryman, and Family and Community in Ireland, were also distinctive in another respect. These texts...were the first of the cultural-anthropological studies, now so widely distributed, to cross the ocean to the old World of Europe and high civilisation (Arensberg [1968] 1988 : 10).

In this sense, the Harvard Irish Study precipitated the introduction of American anthropology and archaeology into Ireland and earned a place in history for the main researchers. The methodological and theoretical impacts on Irish anthropology and archaeology were to be profound. For Conrad Arensberg, The Irish Countryman became ‘a classic ethnography on rural Irish life’ and is still in print in the US. It continues to be used as a college textbook. Indeed in the US, it is better known and more widely read than the more substantial Family and Community in Ireland.

The 1940 and 1968 editions of Family and Community in Ireland are separated by more than a considerable span of years. The 1940 edition, largely penned by Arensberg, consists of thirteen chapters with an introduction, conclusion and illustrations and is concerned mainly with rural life. The 1968 edition presents the book in two parts, ‘The Countryside’ and ‘The Town’. In that edition, the substance of Kimball’s thesis was published and an extra six chapters on Ennis town which had not appeared in the first edition were finally brought into the public domain. As the notes to the Second Edition imply, it was originally intended that two separate volumes be published but the Second World War intervened and interrupted these plans. We also know from our researches that a third section, to include material on politics,

54Personal communication, Vivian Garrison Arensberg with Anne Byrne, February 2001.
religion and the class system, was planned for inclusion in *Family and Community in Ireland*.\(^{55}\) In the event, this section never appeared.

Arensberg and Kimball subsequently enjoyed successful careers as innovative and influential pioneering anthropologists, careers that began to take shape in the narrow streets and crowded markets of Ennis and in the fields and homes among the limestone crags of rural Clare.

**Family and Community in Ireland as a Classic Text**

‘Classic’ scientific texts may, as Jeffrey Alexander (1996: 22) suggests, be seen as earlier works that are given ‘...a privileged status vis-à-vis contemporary explorations in the same field’. Has, we can ask, Arensberg and Kimball’s *Family and Community in Ireland* acquired the ‘privileged status’ that Alexander regards as essential to the classic? Certainly the work of the Harvard anthropologists has been a continuing source of fascination for Irish ethnographers and for students of the historical development of ethnography more generally. Peter Gibbon (1973: 484) complained in the 1970s that ‘...Irish anthropology has done little else but revisit Arensberg and Kimball.’ A decade later, Thomas Wilson’s (1984: 5) overview of the Irish ethnographic literature contains the judgement that

it is difficult, if not impossible, to think of another ethnography from a different country which so profoundly affected the analysis of that country’s society that all subsequent research for a generation had as its central focus, the testing of the ethnographic model of the original.

Two broad sets of reasons why Arensberg and Kimball’s *Family and Community in Ireland* has acquired its standing as a classic text of social anthropology will now be briefly explored. One of these sets might be considered ‘theoretical’; the other derives from the ethnographic ‘benchmark’ that the Americans’ work has been taken to provide for the study of ‘traditional’ rural society in Ireland. These theoretical and benchmark dimensions can be separated for purposes of the present discussion but, as we

---

shall see, they have been combined in intricate ways in the history of the
reception of Arensberg and Kimball’s work.

There are a number of dimensions to the ‘theory’ that informs or
surrounds Arensberg and Kimball’s Irish book. Perhaps the first of these
arises from the Clare study’s association with W. Lloyd Warner’s attempt to
extend the field methods of social anthropology from so-called primitive
societies to modern industrial ones. As director of the social anthropology
segment of the Harvard Irish Study, Lloyd Warner had definite ideas as to the
direction social anthropology should take. The earlier speculative history that
had passed for anthropology in the nineteenth century was to be firmly
abandoned. Under Durkheim’s influence, the challenge for Warner and his
followers was to turn social anthropology ‘into a social science investigating
the nature of social behavior, with hypotheses tested inductively by
comparative research upon societies of diverse types’ (Warner 1968: xii). As
well as steering clear of speculative history, the requirements of comparative
research meant that social anthropology could no longer focus exclusively on
the study of ‘exotic peoples’ (Warner 1968: xi). The Clare study, the fieldwork
for which was initiated by Warner on visits to Ireland in the summers of 1931
and 1932, immediately followed Warner’s own research in Newburyport,
Massachusetts, later to be published and to become famous as the ‘Yankee
City’ studies. Both Arensberg and Kimball, as young undergraduate students,
had cut their ethnographic teeth as research assistants on the Yankee City
study site.

Warner’s ambitious study of Newburyport was testament to a belief that
anthropologists had to join the sociologists in studying contemporary
societies. ‘If this means’, Warner (1968: xiii) claimed in the late 1930s, ‘that
the subject matter of ethnology is the same as that of sociology, so much the
better. Anthropologists may then make effective use of sociological methods,
sociologists of anthropological ones’. In the years after the Second World War,
Warner’s idea of adopting the ethnographic methods of social anthropology in
the study of ‘advanced’ society was to become commonplace. The comparative
science that he dreamed of creating, however, was not to materialise, certainly
not in the way he imagined it would. Undoubtedly Warner’s comparative
project – to which the Clare study was hoped to make an important
contribution - is of great historical interest, but it cannot be said to be the main reason why Arensberg and Kimball's *Family and Community in Ireland* was to achieve its standing as a classic text.

A second possibility we can pursue is that *Family and Community in Ireland*’s classic status reflects its commitment to the theoretical framework known as functionalism or structural-functionalism. In the introduction to their Irish book, Arensberg and Kimball (1968: xxx) reveal that

experience in Yankee City in New England had led the authors to the point of view which is the central hypothesis of functional anthropology. The more they worked, the more it grew certain for them that to a certain approximation it is useful to regard society as an integrated system of mutually interrelated and functionally interdependent parts. A study in Ireland, then, should be a study to test this hypothesis.

Several authors who have subsequently studied and commented on Arensberg and Kimball’s work suggest that its functionalist theoretical framework is crucial to the influence it has been able to exert. ‘As far as British community studies are concerned’, Colin Bell and Howard Newby (1974: xlvi) suggest, ‘Arensberg and Kimball’s study of Co. Clare, *Family and Community in Ireland*, appears to be the most direct means by which the influence of functionalist anthropology has become established.’ By virtue of its functionalism *Family and Community in Ireland*’s influence in Ireland has been even more dramatic. Wilson (1984: 1) suggests that

...for the forty years after Arensberg and Kimball completed their research in County Clare, ethnographers, with few exceptions, have utilized the same unit of analysis (the community), the same focus for the analysis of social life (kinship and social structure) and the same theoretical model of local society (structural-functionalism).

While there may be general acknowledgement that the Americans’ functionalism is its main theoretical claim to fame,\(^56\) Arensberg and Kimball’s
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\(^56\)Ronald Rudin (1994: 261-7), in a thought-provoking comparison of Arensberg and Kimball’s work in Ireland with the ethnographies of Everett Hughes and Horace Miner in Quebec, suggests that the functionalism of Warner, Hughes and Miner was heavily influenced by the ‘Chicago school’, especially by Robert Park’s social ecological approach. Social ecology likened society (or community) to an organism required to adapt to its environment for the sake of survival, and steered the focus of ethnographic investigation on to the territorial or spatial dimensions of social organisation. It is this Chicago influence, Rudin argues, that accounts for some crucial similarities in the questions asked and in the answers supplied in the Irish and Quebec ethnographies.
functionalism was to offer hostages to fortune over the longer term. The reason for this is that functionalism come under sustained attack, for its putative inability to handle change and conflict, from the 1960s on. By the early 1970s, Gibbon (1973: 484) could remark how ‘every good radical instinctively rejects or thinks he rejects functionalism’. At the very least, once functionalism fell from favour in anthropology, the risk of it becoming a poisoned chalice greatly increased. As part of the attack on functionalism and the move to political economy approaches, rural community studies came to distinguish between the ideology and the reality of community (Dennis 1968; Newby et al. 1978: 269-271), to register the impact of wider economic restructuring and to take account of the changes and conflicts prompted by the appearance of newcomers in the form of commuters, retired persons and second home owners (Newby 1980: 24 - 31, 77-85).

Ethnographers may not be coming to their fieldwork with functionalist assumptions any longer, but they are still very much using the method of participant observation. Does, we can ask, Family and Community in Ireland’s classic standing reflect the theoretical importance of its fieldwork innovations, particularly where the methodology of participant observation is concerned? William F. Whyte (1964), in reflecting on the ethnographic approach he was to use in his famous study of the Boston Italian community that features in Street Corner Society, singles out Arensberg as especially important to the development of his own ideas. In retracing his first hesitant steps as a would-be ethnographer in 1936-7, Whyte (1964: 9-10) recalls how

…I was extraordinarily fortunate in meeting Conrad M. Arensberg at the very outset of my Harvard appointment. He also was a junior fellow, so that we naturally saw much of each other. After having worked for some months with W. Lloyd Warner in the Yankee City study, he had gone with Solon Kimball to make a study of a small community in Ireland. When I met him he had just returned from this field trip and was beginning to write up his data. With Eliot Chapple, he was also in the process of working out a new approach to the analysis of social organization. The two men had been casting about together for ways of establishing such social research on a more scientific basis. Going over the Yankee City data and the Irish study, also, they had set up five different theoretical schemes. One after the other each of the first four schemes fell to the ground under their own searching criticism or under the prods of Henderson or Elton Mayo or others whom they consulted. At last they began to develop a theory of interaction. They felt that,
whatever else might be subjective in social research, one could establish objectively the pattern of interaction among people: how often A contacts B, how long they spend together, who originates action when A, B, and C are together, and so on. Careful observation of such interpersonal events might then provide reliable data upon the social organisation of a community. At least this was the assumption. Since the theory grew out of research already done, it was natural that these previous studies did not contain as much of the quantitative data as the theory would have required. So it seemed that I might be one of the first to take the theory out into the field.

Important as was the influence Arensberg had on Whyte, *Family and Community in Ireland* is not as widely admired today for its innovative approach to participant observation as its real contribution might lead one to expect.

The second group of reasons why *Family and Community in Ireland* has merited the description of ‘classic’ reflects its standing as a ‘benchmark’ ethnographic study, one that is continuously returned to for the baseline it provides of ‘traditional’ rural society in Ireland. If there are some difficulties facing attempts to establish *Family and Community in Ireland*’s classical status on theoretical grounds, the book’s significance as an ethnographic benchmark (if an often disputed one) is not in any doubt. It was not only a substantial book and one that appeared very early on, but it chose to focus predominantly on by far the largest segment of the rural population – the smallholders. These reasons were important to its success as a benchmark, but by far the major reason why Irish anthropology has done little else but revisit Arensberg and Kimball is that many of the anthropologists and sociologists with an interest in Ireland have been greatly preoccupied with the processes of Irish ‘modernisation’. Arensberg and Kimball’s work, given its subject matter and timing, has been taken as providing the classic account of what pre-modern Irish society looked like. The Ireland of the early 1930s was very heavily rural and the ‘rural folk’ (as Arensberg and Kimball sometimes called them) were firmly in the grip of customary beliefs and practices. Electricity, and the new phase of agricultural modernisation it would bring, had yet to arrive in the rural areas. Outside the largest towns, manufacturing industry was virtually unknown.
Arensberg and Kimball were positively optimistic about the society they encountered in 1930s Clare. ‘Any acquaintance with Ireland at all’, they suggest (1968: xxxi),

soon establishes the fact that far from being on the retreat, the distinctive culture of Ireland is increasing in strength and autonomy, however much it has learned to assimilate the technological and other developments of the modern age.

Arensberg’s optimism surfaced in a very public way during the period of his fieldwork. After spending some time in north Clare observing the spring work on the land, he gave an interview to the local newspaper that is full of enthusiasm for the life of the smallholder. Interviewed by the Clare Champion in 1933, he is reported as saying:

At times like this, when most nations are groaning under the weight of vast city populations who can no longer support themselves, it is a relief to watch people capable of providing for nearly all their needs by their own independent efforts. Of course, Ireland has her own problems, too, but she is, I think, fortunate in still having her small self-supporting farm families.\(^57\)

Hugh Brody (1973) may not have led the way in treating Arensberg and Kimball as the traditional baseline against which the modernisation (and disintegration) of the rural areas commences, but, though critical of their functionalism, he did set the terms for the debate that broke out in the 1970s over the American study’s validity as a benchmark.\(^58\) Gibbon (1973) used the occasion of reviewing Brody’s Inishkillane to launch a full-scale assault on the validity of Arensberg and Kimball’s approach and findings. Basically Gibbon rejects the way the distinction between the ‘traditional’ and the ‘modern’ has been applied in Ireland. His argument is that Arensberg and Kimball’s rural Ireland was already modern in fundamental respects. Certainly its agriculture had been heavily influenced by the logic of capitalism since the nineteenth century. Arensberg and Kimball’s adherence to functionalism resulted, according to Gibbon, in an ethnography incapable of registering either the
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57 Clare Champion, 13 May, 1933, p. 1.
58 For a flavour of the main debate, see Bell (1982), Wilson (1984; 1997), Kane et al. (1988), Tovey (1992), Rudin (1994) and Tovey and Share (2000: 346-8).
presence of processes of class differentiation tied to commercialisation or serious and deep-seated class and inter-generational conflicts.

What Arensberg and Kimball as well as Brody fail to face up to, as Gibbon (1973: 493) sees it, is

why certain characteristic features of Irish society appear so redolent, and why some of them at least appear now to be taking a more acute form than before. Ever since the famine, Irish rural society has been producing ‘demoralisation’, marginalisation, depression, contraction of small and middle peasant enterprise, and the rise of graziers and shopkeepers. Ever since the famine, ‘mutual-aid’ has been both embodying differentiation within the peasant community and amplifying it. Ever since the famine, patriarchalism has been brittle and attitudes to the ‘true’, ‘traditional’ cultural ambivalent. Ever since the famine the peasant ‘community’ (which at the best of times included only the middle peasants), has been disintegrating.

Among those who regard Arensberg and Kimball’s work as primarily theoretical, Gibbon undoubtedly goes furthest in suggesting that Family and Community in Ireland’s functionalism had a profoundly distorting affect on the ethnographic account. ‘Arensberg and Kimball’s functionalist theoretical position’, as Gibbon (1973: 491) reads it,

produced an account of the Luogh [one of Family and Community in Ireland’s three rural fieldwork sites] which had more in common with the visions of obscurantist nativists and revivalists than with concrete reality. On every score – the family, the ‘mutual-aid’ system, the economic and cultural stability of the system, and its politics – their account ranges from the inaccurate to the fictive.

Gibbon is not alone in coming to such a harsh judgement. The year following Gibbon’s contribution, Bell and Newby (1974: 43) offered the more measured assessment that Arensberg and Kimball’s ‘theoretical perspective undoubtedly influenced what they “saw” and their rather arcadian view of the way of life of the Irish peasantry appears to be derived in some measure from the dictates of their “master system”’.

The main figure who has rallied in defence of Arensberg and Kimball’s ethnography has been Damian Hannan, who in his initial paper makes the point that though Gibbon is justified in criticising Arensberg and Kimball for their excessive functionalist emphasis on ‘consensus and integration’ (1978: 58), he goes too far in formulating his alternative account on historical
evidence drawn from the poorest agricultural districts, where conditions differed markedly from the areas covered by Arensberg and Kimball (1978: 57; 1979: 30). Hannan accepts as by and large valid the various organising principles of social structure set out by Arensberg and Kimball — patrilineal and impartible inheritance, patriarchal authority structures, stem family marriage and apportionment conventions and customary patterns of inter-farm co-operation. Small farm society in the inter-war years was remarkable for its localistic frame of reference, acceptance of low living standards and adherence to ‘traditional’ patterns of economic and social conduct. Marriage and generational replacement statistics in the 1920s and 1930s show small western farmers having appreciably better marriage and intergenerational replacement rates than large farmers in eastern Ireland. Hannan’s explanation for this pattern is to point to the presence of a viable peasant culture that made it socially acceptable for young women to marry small western farmers, something their daughters were increasingly loath to do by the early 1940s.

In commenting on the contributions of Gibbon and Hannan, Varley (1981) makes the point that the interpretation of Arensberg and Kimball’s baseline depends on making Family and Community in Ireland’s functionalism more explicit. He attempts to do this by taking their declared assumptions and building a simple functionalist model capable of setting out the conditions required for small farm survival. How well these conditions were met is then explored with reference to the full range of the Americans’ own evidence. This reconstruction of Arensberg and Kimball’s ethnographic account, which entails an exploration of how small farm society was structured institutionally and ideologically, indicates that the maintenance and reproduction of small farms in 1930s Clare faced a number of distinguishable difficulties that impinged on the survival chances of the small farm. Where the transmission of the family farm to the next generation was concerned, for instance, a number of characteristic disturbances accompanied the pre-transmission, transmission and post-transmission phases of the family cycle. These disturbances were capable of generating intense conflict. When Family and Community in Ireland is reconstructed in the way
attempted by Varley, much evidence in Arensberg and Kimball can be brought to light that supports neither Gibbon nor Hannan.

Drawing on the insight of the commoditisation perspective that simple or petty commodity production is to be regarded as an integral part of even advanced capitalist societies, Chris Curtin (1986) has also taken issue with Gibbon, arguing that commoditisation may historically be more accurately seen as having provided a means of survival to west of Ireland smallholders. Curtin (1986: 75) makes the case for a ‘commoditisation theory’ perspective that regards western smallholders as ‘domestic commodity producers’, reliant on family labour, but whose reproduction is crucially underpinned by the interaction between farm households pursuing a variety of survival strategies (different farming specialisms, part-time farming, state transfers and so on) and a range of commodity markets. On the basis of this analysis, Curtin accuses Gibbon of an overly pessimistic and deterministic Marxist analysis and Hannan of being misled by a Chayanovian model that is at odds with the extensive market penetration prevailing in the rural west since the nineteenth century.

What conclusions are possible on the basis of our discussion so far? Two views may be taken of the classical status of the ethnographic benchmark found in Arensberg and Kimball. The pessimistic view is that the debate around Arensberg and Kimball has led to a dead end. The most trenchant version of this position is to be found in Gibbon (1974: 496) when he asserts that

It was a misfortune for Irish social science that this path-breaking, essentially theoretical work should have an Irish rural area as its subject. Arensberg and Kimball’s extremely one-sided ethnography, an ethnography which saw only harmony, integration and stability in Irish rural society, has left behind it a trail of mystification.

Wilson (1984) would not go nearly as far as this. But he does say that ‘the anthropology of Ireland has failed to define problems relevant to comparative European anthropology, the research of other disciplines in Ireland, or the everyday concerns of Irish people’ (Wilson 1984: 1).

The more positive view, on the other hand, is that we are in Arensberg and Kimball’s debt for the glimpses of a still vibrant smallholder society they
provide us with. To the extent that anthropology is a discursive discipline (there is always more than one valid answer to the questions it poses), the achievement of Arensberg and Kimball has been to open up debates around a whole range of subjects. More than 60 years after Family and Community in Ireland's appearance, the book is still capable of attracting readers and even of generating passion.59

**Studying Cultures: Functionalism, Scientism and Physical Anthropology**

In the previous section, we mentioned some objections which have been made to Family and Community in Ireland, many associated with the authors' 'functionalist' approach to understanding society. Suggesting that later commentators have often misunderstood Arensberg and Kimball's theoretical approach, we offer a further reassessment of it here. First, we should take into account the wider context of the study of human society during the 1930s. Imagining what a society was did not call up the same panoply of institutions and conventional channels for power which it might today. Yet societies were composed of millions of people who clearly moved according to common conventions, at least part of the time; and social existence does differ from place to place, though it is not always obvious how or why. Thus it could seem reasonable to seek patterns or principles to make clearer how groups of people could share arrangements for ordering their lives. Not only this, but understanding how societies worked might help us to improve them, to deal constructively with problems in social organisation, rather than fumbling with public life in ignorance of the results such action might be expected to have.

This is the background of concern from which Arensberg and Kimball write (p.306). Their wish to understand how societies worked entails central questions of meaning and relationship, conflict and change. Hence their major effort is to envisage sociality, to picture the ways in which human lives and

59The debate surrounding the Irish 'stem family' might be singled out for special mention (see Gibbon and Curtin (1978); Fitzpatrick (1983); Varley (1983); Gibbon and Curtin (1983a and b); Breen (1984); Harris (1988); Birdwhistle-Pheasant (1992) and Curtin et al. (1992).
interests depend on their enmeshment with other lives and interests. In the social sciences, as in literature, this task is constantly being attempted anew. For Arensberg and Kimball, what they see as ‘functionalism’ summarises their effort to understand the ways in which, for instance, a buyer’s and a seller’s view of a fair bargain at market can be related both to each other’s habits and beliefs and to the ways of life they both share: the ways in which they survive and get their livings, in the setting of their common culture. This theoretical approach is an exploration of shared aspects of living in society, not the outmoded set of over-simplified assumptions which commentators have sometimes assumed.

The sociological functionalism which developed in America, in particular, in the 1950s and 1960s is often seen as having concentrated on large-scale, static, quantitative analyses at the expense of more individual studies of change, meaning and time (Martins 1974). The sociologist Talcott Parsons, for example, is frequently reproached with devising a systemic model of society in which individuals merely play out the roles allotted to them in the wider scheme of things. Structural functionalism in American sociology tended to be used to defend ‘meritocratic’ capitalism as a purportedly conflict-free social form. None of this applies to the work by Arensberg and Kimball. The anthropological functionalism practised between the wars was generally associated with work in the field, using what we now term participant observation (Platt 1996: 115). It was not entirely disconnected from its successor, for instance in seeking to explain social processes in terms of their contributions to maintaining an entire setting, or searching for ‘key’ patterns in terms of which others can be made clear. But for Arensberg and Kimball, functionalism is most interestingly a way of trying to provide a language expressing the conjoint nature of many activities and attitudes in social life. They are anxious to explore interconnections between people and their practices, and in doing so they marshal data not dissimilarly from many social scientists writing today.

Moreover, although it is true that Arensberg and Kimball view local economic life in Clare as approximately benign, and though they present change within that local setting as constantly absorbed into its overall pattern, they are far from oblivious to longer-term, negative social developments.
Dealing with town life, for example, the authors highlight the role of young people from the countryside who move into towns to work, carrying with them family obligations and relationships. ‘From family they drew that strength which gave them entrance and ensured their survival as they encountered the new values of the urban world and its social class divisions’ (p.ix). This lends chilling force to the contention that the scope of family ties declines as economic influences penetrate what were formerly interpersonal values and goals. If the authors are right in suggesting that the values of family and local loyalty used to help people to resist negative aspects of socio-economic change, this has grave implications for contemporary settings where family support is further attenuated.

Like many other American authors of their time - the influential sociologist Cooley (1918), or the social pragmatist school (Joas 1993) - Arensberg and Kimball are fascinated by sociality itself. They are absorbed by the fact that so much human social behaviour can only be explained in terms of other activities: people ‘do these things because they do those others’ (p.xxvii). This does not imply that these authors at any stage ignore social change. Their later work, Culture and Community, emphasises the view of community as ‘process’ (1965: 70). The same idea can be detected in their earlier writing. Nonetheless, in the two parts of the Clare study published as ‘The Countryside’ and ‘The Town’, war, civil strife, poverty and ‘victims’ of the system are of comparatively minor interest. Arensberg and Kimball are perfectly clear about the constraints on their knowledge of Clare; what they are trying to understand is the basic social map which makes sense of people’s behaviour there.

Here the authors feel confident in identifying a ‘mutual independence and functional interconnection between kinds of activity among the small farmers’, the main feature of the social map. In order to picture this they use the metaphor of ‘parts of the social organism’ employed by ‘anthropologists of the “functional” school’ (p.xxviii). Yet, referring to their training on the Newburyport/Yankee City study, they emphasise that ‘to a certain approximation is it useful to regard society as an integrated system of mutually interrelated and functionally interdependent parts’ (p.xxx). This expressly distances them from dogmatism, and the authors repudiate any
‘rigid insistence’ on any particular approach ‘within the broad confines’ of a functionalism which alerts us to social interdependencies. Functionalism, for them, is a heuristic, a set of guidelines for observation, rather than an out-and-out ‘theory’. Most fundamental to them is their commitment to showing how events in one part of society affect those in another. This approach could, they write, be ‘better stated’ as charting ‘the effect of some events of human social life upon others’: their work as a whole is ‘an essay in the interconnectedness of the conditions of human social life’ (p.xxviii).

This at no point entails that Arensberg and Kimball wish to ignore the parts which individuals play in daily and social life. Their description of the older people in Rynamona, or of the shopkeepers in Ennis, very clearly show people taking their fates into their own hands and exerting influence over what happens to them. It is just that they do this within certain confines: they do not choose the cloth from which they cut their coats.

Here the work by Arensberg and Kimball prefigures discussion of social structure and human agency towards the end of the twentieth century by writers such as Anthony Giddens (Giddens 1984; see Haugaard 1997). Arensberg and Kimball’s whole effort is to describe the sociality of human action while preserving a sense of the importance to it of individual actions and intentions. On the question whether social structures or individual actions cause what happens in any situation, Family and Community in Ireland answers, both. Like their informants in Ennis, the authors know that overall social situations impose conditions on what is likely to happen, and shape what it makes sense to undertake. Economic activity, family and sexual life, time itself are constituted by social meanings. But within these settings, the book implies, it is up to each person to cultivate the skill, industry and persistence to achieve as good a life as possible. Individuals can resist blows of fate, or their life plans may - with bad luck - be ruined by circumstances. We see this time and again from the stories they relate about people who, by good judgement, have risen to local prominence, or who, by ill-considered actions or misfortune, have sunk below the levels from which they started. Unlike some later exponents of the functionalist approach to understanding society, Arensberg and Kimball both care about the individual’s influence on his or her own destiny, and believe that it matters.
This concern was, for them, related to their emphasis on objective science – which also needs to be understood in its historical and intellectual setting. According to its preface, this work was conceived as part of a project intended to issue in a world-wide classification of human societies, a collection of comparisons, which would yield testable hypotheses about the ways in which human societies are organised. This would be ‘objective’ - not in the late twentieth-century association of the term with extreme scientism, but at least in the sense that it would eschew personal judgements and partial emphases and result in reliable knowledge. Such knowledge was expected to issue from a blend of sociological and anthropological methods which were regarded, in the 1930s, as relatively straightforward to use and issuing in what could reasonably be regarded as accurate accounts.

The theoretical world of the 1930s contained very different intellectual divisions and allegiances from those familiar today. The ‘scientism’ to which Arensberg and Kimball often seem to subscribe was not then, as Platt points out, a single, shared, definite set of concepts (1996: 105). It tended to mean carrying out academic work without personal bias; it did not entail following a particular set of intellectual procedures, and particularly it did not entail a slavish attempt to transplant the methods of the natural sciences into the study of human behaviour (Platt 1996: 37). At Chicago, for instance - the eventual intellectual home of Warner, Arensberg and Kimball’s supervisor - to work scientifically meant staying close to one’s data, being committed to empirical work, and making only assertions which could be shown to be well founded in terms of that empirical work (Platt 1996: 266). It is true that Arensberg and Kimball hoped, as most social scientists would not do now, that their results would contribute to ‘an explanation of the uniformities of human action’ (p.xxvii). But nothing in their writings leads us to conclude that they imagine these uniformities as operating in exactly the same way as laws in the physical world, since they consistently ascribe so much significance to human meaning and agency.

Arensberg and Kimball, then, were writing at a time when interpreting human behaviour was not considered incompatible with searching for its underlying laws. Arensberg’s (1937) account of anthropology, in particular, is
explicitly oriented to questions of social meaning. As he puts it (1937: 6), he is interested in ‘the human beings who are the momentary bearers of the culture’. He describes a ‘shift of emphasis’ among anthropologists in which one no longer enquires merely into overall habits and customs - marriage patterns or burial practices - but asks what people ‘do or think’ in acquiring mates (1937: 7), ‘what makes them act so, and how do their actions affect other departments of their lives?’ Of a hunting instrument such as a bow, one might specifically ask ‘what does it mean to you and your friends...?’ (1937: 7). This is a shift ‘from a history of forms and institutions to a study of behaviour’ (1937: 7), specifically directed by awareness of the fact that a human being ‘is a social creature’ (1937: 7). People cannot be understood except as members of groups; thus, anthropology ‘must conceive itself more and more as a social science’ (1937: 8).

But, Arensberg says, the advantage of observing small-scale interactions between individuals is more significant than this alone. Supposing two brothers quarrel in Melanesia. The dispute can both ensue from and swing into motion ‘the whole traditional, habitual apparatus of tribal life’ (1937: 11). Observing this can mean that ‘the dynamic functions of a whole social system are capable of description’ (1937: 11). Settling the quarrel, for example, uses means which ‘reveal the patterns of social action’ making up the ‘reciprocities’ binding one member of the society to another. The metaphysical and spiritual views of the society affect people’s behaviour so as to ‘canalize’ the ways in which it is thought fitting for one member to atone for his offence (1937: 11). When small-scale events happen, they nonetheless happen in the terms made available by the overall setting.

For Arensberg, it does not seem inappropriate to express this in language which has different connotations today. He says that small-scale analysis ‘affords a chance for an objective analysis of social forces as controllable and as demonstrable as a study of chemical interaction’ (1937: 11). He is emphasising that human beings think and behave in terms of their social circumstances and the habits and practices which make sense within those circumstances. A farmer in Melanesia or Clare, or a stockbroker in New York, will quarrel and make up the quarrel in terms derived from what Arensberg calls the ‘habitual apparatus’ provided by their respective cultures. Thus
Arensberg and Kimball describe a fratricide in County Roscommon. One of two brothers who inherited a farm was too weak with asthma to make enough profit to provide his sister with a dowry or to pay his brother the two hundred pounds their father’s will had stipulated. Instead, he is said to have kept the younger brother in virtual slavery, working the farm, and it is easy to see how this situation came to seem inextricable to everyone involved. When the younger man shot his brother dead, the authors ‘point out the provenance of the crime in a social situation arising from the family system’ (p.113).

*Family and Community in Ireland* is a work, therefore, in which the general and the particular are consistently intertwined. The dichotomy between society and individual is a false one (p.xxxiii). Believing that the small- and the large-scale, psychology and sociology, are indivisibly linked (p.xxxiii), the authors refer to ‘personal relations, individual and group activities, expressions of sentiment and emotion of every kind’, using them as ‘expository matter’ in explaining how general processes work out (p.xxxii). ‘Detail, local color, dramatic incident, and specific quotations’ (p.xxxii) may have oblique, complicated or even contradictory relations to larger states of affairs. They are not taken for granted as microcosms of large-scale situations, but are used as textual devices to enable the reader to imagine processes which are essentially social. Like social scientists writing today, Arensberg and Kimball are obliged to select ‘telling’ details in order to communicate (Edmondson 1984, 2000). They support the idea of ‘an objective social science’ involving ‘an impersonal technique for reducing to order’ social data, as do the natural sciences (p.xxxiii), and functionalist theory is used to suggest how this order might be perceived. But this does not entail, for them, an end to meaning and imagination.

This brings us to the question of the physical anthropology which formed part of the Harvard Irish Study. Though Arensberg and Kimball themselves had little contact with the physical anthropologists in Ireland, Arensberg’s 1937 work acknowledges the status of physical anthropology as an intellectual enterprise in which Harvard was a leading institution. He writes that ‘Man, like all animals, has his species, his subspecies, his races, and his hereditary strains,’ which we can legitimately attempt to render as ‘uniform
laws’: ‘Some day we may know more certainly the biologically determined inherencies of man’ (1937: 18-19). Such views have come to have sinister implications. The activities of the physical anthropologists in Ireland precisely paralleled those by their counterparts in National Socialist Germany in the same period. The Aryan Race which Hitler sought to establish was held to be detectable in all its sub-categories by physical characteristics, described in German schoolbooks of the time, and measured in just the ways used by Dupertuis and his colleagues in Ireland.

This did not imply that Arensberg and Kimball were searching for ‘pure’ human strains, a position frequently associated with racism in politics and science since the second half of the nineteenth century. Nineteenth-century century philologists had categorised languages and the ‘races’ who spoke them in order of merit, viewing the ‘Teutonic’ cultures as superior. The latter assumption was countered by Ernest Renan’s vision of the Celt as more civilised and cultured, if more ‘feminine’ (Cairns and Richards 1988: 45-6). Matthew Arnold consequently urged that the English might use the Celtic ‘quickness of perception’ in their own mongrel blood to counteract the philistinism of their more masculine, Germanic heritage. According to Ashley (2001), a related concern with race and purity of life influenced the work of Haddon and Brown in the Aran Islands in the 1890s.

Arensberg speculates fleetingly about the intermingling of ‘bloods’ from the original strains in Europe – which implies that they no longer exist on their own (1937: 19). The two authors together see Ireland as presenting ‘a distinctive and characteristic tradition dating back to pre-Christian and pre-Roman times’, but at the same time they acknowledge the relativity of all cultural classifications (p.xxxi). The differences between the Irish and, say, the English, within an overall occidental tradition, derive from ‘differences of behavior and outlook’, ‘products of quite different ways of life’ (ibid.) - not specifically from racial or inherited characteristics. Later, in Culture and Community, Arensberg and Kimball show themselves highly conscious of human diversity, and consistently opposed to ethnocentric attitudes (1965: 228, 230).

In attempting to understand some part of the intellectual motivation for physical anthropology, it is important to note that, in the early part of the
twentieth century, associating the exploration of human physicality with questions of race and breeding was by no means unusual. It was confined neither geographically, to areas such as the German-speaking countries, nor politically, to those harbouring right-wing or fascist convictions. It was widely taken for granted throughout the Western world that a rational approach to understanding human beings might embrace an effort to understand the effects of inherited characteristics of groups of people on human affairs. The attempt to understand the implications of human physicality has not since been solved; nor has it been freed from serious political implications. Even in fields such as psychiatry, trends towards ‘evidence-based treatment’ and ‘algorithmic methods’ imply that human attitudes and behaviour can be grasped and responded to strictly in terms of generalisations on the basis of empirical observation. Contemporary debates on cloning and genetic manipulation lead on from the physical anthropology discussions of a century ago.

During the nineteenth century, science and the knowledge of nature had become ardently regarded as sources of human social redemption. Darwin’s cousin, Francis Galton, coined the term ‘eugenics’ in 1883, summarising his work on the ‘science’ of improving human stock by giving more noble blood the opportunity to prevail over less (Kevles 1985: ix). Galton believed it possible ‘to produce a highly gifted race of men by judicious marriages during several consecutive generations’ (Galton 1869: 1). In America, the feminist reformer Elizabeth Cady Stanton advocated restricting marriage to those able to provide children of ‘“splendid physique, strong intellect, and high moral sentiment”’ (Leach 1981: 31). By the twentieth century, such ideas had become common throughout the West. They were not necessarily considered right-wing, and were sometimes supported, as by H. G. Wells, on socialist principles. An emphasis on the significance of race and inheritance in public affairs could be, and was, heavily criticised – but it belonged to the common currency of the times.

Should we reproach the anthropologists of that period for taking part in an intellectual milieu in which physicalist beliefs could eventually be used to justify a Holocaust? This question is not susceptible of easy answers. As far as anthropology is concerned, Adam Kuper points out (2001: 82) that
opinions relevant to racism, colonialism and other forms of domination were always sharply divided among scholars. He names Radcliffe-Brown, an acknowledged central influence on Arensberg and Kimball, as ‘firmly committed to the liberal, anti-segregationist cause’ (2001: 83). Kimball’s own obituary underlines the fact that he was vehemently anti-colonial (Moore 1984). Moral and political convictions, rather than scientific debates alone, seem to be decisive in determining scholars’ allegiances to public causes.

Arensberg outlines his views on relations between the races more clearly in his account of anthropologists’ former predilections for studying ‘primitive’ tribes (1937: 8ff.). This has taught us, he says, that modern human beings are not as different from them as has been thought. ‘Typically modern logic’ is by no means rare among the Bushman, and, as for ourselves, ‘typically “primitive” behaviour characterizes us all at moments’ (1937: 8). We should not see the difference between ‘the barbarian and the civilized man’ as ‘simple’: Arensberg underlines similarities in logic, institutions, beliefs and feelings between the two. He points out that no reputable anthropologist can believe in ‘unilinear evolution’ (1937: 3), and that field ethnologists have ‘demolished civilized man’s pretension to the sole possession of the adult mind’ (1937: 4). Through studying peoples such as these we have come to ‘an ever greater objectivity’ in which we see moral claims as ‘expressions of particular times and places’ (1937: 5). ‘One cannot read a page of modern ethnological description from Malinowski in Melanesia to the Hershkovites in Guiana without a shock to one’s complacency’ (1937: 4). Our own ‘civilisation’, in fact, offers no guarantee of moral correctness. Arensberg is far from assuming that ‘advanced’ civilisations are supreme or physical characteristics decisive in developing them.

**Family and Community in Ireland**

This section summarises what we see as main aspects of the contents of *Family and Community in Ireland*, which begin with its authors’ insistence on Ireland’s ‘distinctive and characteristic’ variant of Western European civilization, its ‘behavior and outlook’, which are ‘products of quite different
ways of life’ from those of the English (p.xxxi). Their portrait of this society focuses neither simply on individuals nor simply on social processes, but on the relations between individuals which make it up. Showing how this ‘organization of habit’ (p.263) functions, they both furnish fascinating details of life as it was lived in the Ireland of the 1930s, and raise perennially significant questions about the way human society works.

Many of these questions revolve around the developing crisis of modernity to which their work points. In the particular blend of individual action and social process which they explore, Arensberg and Kimball see individuals as bound into their family and local settings. Personal preference is a secondary question in comparison with the wellbeing of the people among whom one lives. But this is a setting which can absorb change without being transformed by it, at least in the short term. By the end of the century in which they wrote, Irish people had come to have a much stronger sense of their individual rights to make decisions affecting their own lives – but within a socio-economic setting often experienced as immune to control.

Arensberg and Kimball begin their book by describing how the people of Clare get their livings. They note where the grass grows thickest, the fact that creameries are gradually being introduced for collecting milk, how agricultural production varies throughout the county. Ireland was at that time a country so rural that nearly two thirds of its population of just under three million lived ‘outside villages and towns with 200 or more population’ (p.4). The small farmers’ economies on which the authors concentrate were centred on the ‘spatial unit of land and house’, ‘identified with the family in the eyes of its community in name and ownership’ (p.31). The woman of the house would start the day by rekindling the fire in the morning, and her work was unremitting from then on. The custom demanding ‘that some woman of the house be always at work’ (p.65) was far from unique to County Clare. Forty pounds of potatoes might be cooked at once over the fire, the bread baked once or twice a day, the family fed in sittings - the woman serving herself last. The men’s work was divided by Saints’ Days, with St Brigid’s Day (February 1st) marking the start of spring work (as it did elsewhere in Europe in the same era), and St Patrick’s Day (March 17th) marking a promise of dry weather. Except for the holiday period of Advent and Christmas, work was unceasing.
The stage is set for detailed attention to the daily processes of farm life. First there is the issue of the entire family’s contribution to its work. This raises the question of how the two genders co-operate; endorsing a view widely held at that time, the authors emphasise the complementary nature of their activities. This does not entail that they are regarded as equal. But Arensberg and Kimball, as anthropologists, are less interested in judging moral or political lights and shadows than in the patterns which allow the society to continue and its members’ lives to be sustained. Children, for example, are trained in family and farm duties so that, when their turn comes to marry, they can provide future spouses ‘not only the loving consideration of husband or wife but the proper skills in farm economy’ (p.47). Issues of individual preference are worked out within a setting of interpersonal obligations. As in farming economies elsewhere in Europe, farmers’ wives might dispose of profits from eggs and butter - subject to the needs of the family unit (p.47). The father of the family and owner of the farm takes responsibility for decisions about farm work, but this does not bestow individual freedom on him in the modern sense. ‘His first charge is to the family he heads,’ and should he fail in competence, ‘his wife and children are entitled to a just anger against him’ (p.46).

A hard lot falls to farmers’ sons, who must work beside their fathers and learn from them, but despite their efforts have little right to opinions about how tasks should be done or the farm’s profits spent (p.53). The son is ‘subordinated’ ‘to his parents, particularly the father’ (p.52) in the interlocking spheres of economy and family, treated as a ‘boy’ until the age of fifty if his parents have not yet made over the farm to him (p.55). “You can be a boy here forever as long as the old fellow is still alive” (p.55). Arensberg and Kimball describe relations between fathers and sons as sometimes strained in consequence. With mothers, there is much more tenderness, even though the mother retains a permanent right to issue instructions to her son (pp.57, 66-7). Though a young man will join the traditional ‘masculine scorn for feminine interests and pursuits’, he must ‘look for protection to his mother against a too-arbitrary exercise of his father’s power’: her ‘diplomatic, conciliatory role’ allows her ‘to call upon the strongest ties between herself and her sons to
restore rifts in parental authority’. A son may leave the farm for other walks of life, but ‘When one goes home, it is to see one's mother’ (p.58).

Arensberg and Kimball see in this society an ‘absolute coincidence of “social” and “economic” factors within single relationships’ (p.60). The sons are described as all equal, under the father’s direction and control; ‘the years of common effort and common dependence create a strong solidarity between them’ (p.61). They will fight for the farm’s interests if necessary, and must submit to the father’s choice of the son he thinks most competent to run the farm after him (p.63). In the ideal case, this immediate family forms a small ‘corporate economy’, enmeshed within a countryside in which there is ‘also a certain amount of cooperation’ - in lending tools, lending boys or girls to help with particular tasks, for example to help with butter-making, or at times of distress. Especially, interfamilial cooperation occurs when it is necessary to work communally to get in the harvest, or at obligatory family ceremonies such as children’s First Communion (pp.68-9, 72). Indeed it becomes clear that one important aim in acquiring new relations through marriage is the extension of the circle of people one can ask for aid in times of need. ‘Cooring’, like ‘meitheal’ (pp.254ff.), replaces the tedium of solitary work with ‘a pleasant and variegated rhythm which works up an emotional satisfaction which can counteract fatigue and monotony’ (p.259). This constantly intertwined nature of individuals’ with their relations’ lives is explored in terms of a ‘give-and-take’ between them (p.79) which delineates their system of values. Individuals who try to rise above their fellows are quickly accused of forgetting their friends; ‘disloyalty to one’s kinship group is felt to be a deadly crime’ (p.90).

This loyalty is expected to persist even in the absence of family members from the country. The sons and daughters whom the family farm cannot support and who emigrate, often to America, do not view themselves as having abandoned family membership; they continue to send home to Ireland an ‘enormous’ annual total in financial remittances (p.144). This shows how ‘The sentiments of place, farm, and family become so inextricably intermingled as to be almost one’ (p.145). The heavy emigration which the authors see as beginning around 1815 was, by the time of the 1920s, robbing the country of nearly a third of its population. For Arensberg and Kimball,
Ireland’s history of emigration is to be explained directly in terms of the family form which had evolved in the latter half of the nineteenth century. This enabled emigration to become ‘a traditional movement’ allowing landless family members to survive ‘without destroying the family structure or the rural culture’ in question (p.150). The authors repeatedly stress the closeness and affection felt by the members of smallholder families, a theme they emphasise even when dealing with disputes. These can be severe and often involve the interchange of property - particularly land, usually the only considerable possession which people had, and their fundamental source of survival.

Ireland’s very unusual set of marriage rates form a connected phenomenon. In 1926 (the last year for which Census returns were available to Arensberg and Kimball), a man only attained an even chance of marrying when he reached the age of 35. Nonetheless, once people were married, their rate of child-bearing was very high (p.102). Many Irish social scientists now see these patterns as reflecting a restrictive sexual regime which emerged after the Famine from a determination never again to disperse the land into a patchwork of holdings too small to sustain life in an emergency (see Byrne 1997). But for Arensberg and Kimball, the Irish patterns make sense simply in terms of the attitudes and behaviour of country people towards marriage itself. Marriage can only happen when the ‘old couple’ are ready to pass on ownership of the farm to their chosen heir; it means dispersal of the farm family and a change of status for the ‘boys’ and ‘girls’ now to be seen as adult. The family group is an intense, intimate arrangement, necessarily destroyed by a marriage. Those children who cannot inherit must leave, often never to return to Ireland: they ‘must travel’ (Arensberg 1937: 79). This huge ‘turning point in individual histories’ involves ‘transfer of economic control, land ownership, reformation of family ties, advance in family and community status, and entrance into adult procreative sex life’ (p.103). For the older people, it means relinquishing their entire source of power in the family and the neighbourhood. No wonder the older people seek legal provisions to protect their own place on the farm in the future (p.111), and no wonder they hesitate to embark on the whole process at all. The introduction of the old-age pension has eased the situation somewhat; a witness remarks, ‘There is no
chance that the old people would give up the land but for the pension, and there is no hurrying them’ (p.121).

The fact of emigration contributes to a situation in which the proportions of old people in the population are high. ‘Ireland is in some ways an old person’s country’ (p.153). In Ireland in the early twentieth century, 6.7% of men (p.157) and 8.3% of women (p.158) are over seventy; the Irish death rate is the most favourable in Europe, except perhaps for France (p.160). ‘The country people live long and die often very old indeed’ (p.162). According to Arensberg and Kimball, Irish people ‘live long because they have much to live for,’ being ‘honored’ in their own sphere of life: ‘They have power’ (p.162). Here the old in Rynamona are described in particular detail (p.175). One old man in particular, O’Donoghue, is regarded with special respect. As people in the countryside say about similar figures today, when he is gone things will not be the same again (p.177).

The chapter on ‘Familism and Sex’ underlines the heavy distinctions between the ‘complementary’ genders (p.195). Despite the ‘propriety’ of country life (p.196) and its strict ethics (p.198), fecundity is valued highly and boys and girls grow up ‘in an atmosphere of constant reference to sex and breeding’ (p.197). Sexual banter is common (p.199), its ribaldry reinforcing morality rather than undermining it (p.200). Though sexual behaviour is strongly restricted to the realm of marriage, brought about through matchmaking, these arrangements are seen as no less conducive to love and affection than in settings where ‘personal initiative’ seems more obvious (p.202). In ‘the country people’s imagination’, sex and familism go together; sexual impulses are not thought of as in the first place individual. They are expected to relate to the local context, to the extent that ‘young “bucks”’ who try to make girls pregnant are seen as primarily motivated by greed for land and money (p.203). “Patterns” and dances are occasions where anxiety is felt, particularly by the clergy, lest things get out of hand (p.207). An illegitimate pregnancy often results in disappearance from public life (p.209), for it ruins a girl’s reputation. Sexuality is thought to be properly related to maintaining one’s family and its status. Many members need to remain celibate so that the system can continue (p.213), but Arensberg and Kimball do not see this as causing the distress attributed to it by later authors. Sexuality itself is not
imagined as a primarily private and personal concern, though it might often, through matchmaking, provide a path to upward social mobility (p.215), ‘a natural wedding of desire and ambition’ (p.218).

Arensberg and Kimball emphasise the social nature not only of sexuality but also of time and tempo. Dealing with occupational changes over time, the authors argue that economic skills are most important as they fit into the interwoven structure of daily life. It is not that changes in this area take longer in the country, or that country people are resistant to innovation as such. On the contrary, some changes occur ‘surprisingly quickly’, in a way. The important factor is not the time taken in itself, but the way in which an innovation must include everyone and everyone’s way of working. Changes ‘proceed through social relations; they do not overthrow them’ (p.262). Local social and economic life is not abandoned in order to adapt to the change, but the change is made to fit in ‘compatibility’ with the life of the community.

Arensberg and Kimball add to this their recognition of the fundamentally personal and communal sense of place in the Irish countryside. They describe vividly the social complexity of the physical settings in which a Luogh farmer would live. The geographical span of his kin relations differs from that of his place of worship, the disposal of his produce, or the practice of his religion; ‘though in the last analysis each one of these is built up out of his personal experience of human relations’ (p.274). (In the 1930s, when motor cars were used rarely (p.280), if someone lived half a day’s journey from the nearest village (p.278), that was considered close, not far!) Here there is a ‘direct connection’ between the area over which someone moves and his social and economic status. Big farmers go often to Dublin, sometimes even using Dublin tailors; small ones, virtually never, for their own world is made up of the people who know them at home (p.285). They do not need to venture further, for local shops and markets supply all they are likely to need (pp.286-7, pp.288ff.). In the market we can see the farmers’ world in microcosm, their mutual relationships acted out in ‘ceremonial reiteration’ (p.293). The authors do not mean that farmers bargain as they do in order to act out their relationships. Rather, we understand fathers’ relations to sons better when we can see the fathers’ dominance in selling at market. At the same time, it is because we have understood their dominance at home on the farm that we can
so clearly interpret their behaviour when they are buying and selling their animals. An interpretive spiral evolves, making our understanding of people’s relationships richer and more detailed.

The town of Ennis, at that time numbering about six thousand inhabitants, is located ‘in the middle range’ of Irish towns, ‘representative’ of the ‘most characteristic’ urban settlement (pp.309-10). But it possesses a ‘double character’ (p.314), serving the needs of up to a hundred thousand country dwellers. Its whole economy depends on the farmers in this hinterland who both supply produce for sale and purchase clothes and other goods in Ennis - which sets something of the fashion of the district (pp.312-3). In the town, life is ruled by class, a ‘master key’ to its structure (see Curtin and Ryan 1989). ‘The people of Ennis know their “places”’ (p.322) - even though there are surprises: such-and-such a gentleman has been blackballed at the Gentlemen’s Club, and such-and-such a doctor’s wife ‘is never accepted in the upper circles of the town’ (p.324). But even this townlike scenario has rural roots; forty per cent of the townspeople’s fathers, and fifty per cent of their mothers, lived in the country (p.329).

The Ennis shopkeepers and shop assistants are geographically, practically and often socially central to the town. Though family groupings are central here too, they never show a ‘monolithic sameness’ but rather ‘a rich design’ to be disentangled (p.333). ‘Shopkeeping in Ireland is almost exclusively a family enterprise,’ (p.334), ‘one of the rare occupations that is fully open to both sexes’ (p.337), though the women who adopt it tend not to be married - unless to another shopkeeper. Shop assistants, by contrast, whether male or female, tend to be younger, but also to be single - attempting to use their profession as a transition to shop-owning itself (pp.339, 341).

The authors trace the dynamic ‘route of the country youth’ from apprenticeship to becoming a shop assistant, then ‘owner and operator of his own shop with newly acquired spouse’ (pp.342-3). This helps to show ‘how the social diversities of town and country are joined’ (p.343). Young people from the country are hired to work in shops for their amenability and capacity for hard work, and also because their relations at home are expected to patronise the shop and canvass friends to do likewise (p.344). The shopkeeper thus gains, but so do the youth’s family, through their access to favours and
acquaintances via the shopkeeper: ‘the relationship becomes a fully reciprocal one’ (p.344). Just as the country family extends its alliances through marriage, it extends them into the town by sending children into the genteel world of the shop (p.345). The training is long, lasting two to three years and marked by a vast range of skills to be learned - even down to the capacity to predict (and influence) customers' propensities to buy, from glancing at their clothes (p.351). This chapter uses quotations from informants more liberally than others; much of the authors’ knowledge of the workings of Irish society was straightforwardly told to them, by interested and astute indigenous commentators.

It might take a young man a decade to work up to the possession of his own shop, marry and start a family. Just as farmers link property and family by living on their farms, so do the shopkeepers, who live in the buildings where their shops are located (pp.361-2). The authors’ reconstruction of a farmhouse is paralleled here by an account of an average shop (pp.362ff.). Its arrangement ‘emphasizes the ordered relations between the proprietor and his customers’ (p.362), while in the living room upstairs, ‘heirlooms, photographs, and furnishings are symbols which embody and reflect family status’ (p.363). The kitchen at the rear of the house is the woman’s province, the centre of family life (p.364). As on the farm, marriage expresses both sentiment and interest. A young man can only marry when he can afford to set up shop for himself, but when he does so, a wife becomes a positive asset, bringing not only her dowry but also her connections as potential customers (p.365). ‘Shop marriages are as much a contract as marrying on the land,’ claims one informant, explaining how the careful supervision of the match protects the young people. He continues, “If I am to place my daughter in marriage, it is my duty to protect her in every possible way” (p.369). The young woman’s dowry should not put her at a disadvantage by being worth significantly less than her husband’s property; if he should die, it is important that she be the legal owner of their joint property. Of course, these arrangements can often go awry (pp.370-1). The untimely death of a parent before they are made, or the incapacity of the protagonists to make appropriate decisions, can all undermine the efficacy of a system whose ideal result is to the common benefit.
Women, here, are centred on the home and - it appears from these pages - barely leave it except on their solitary visits to church. Women are described as ambitious for their own households before they get them and (except for upper middle class ladies) fully occupied in running them when they do. The men’s lives, though more sociable, are sociable with a purpose. ‘The sociability provided in the nightly gatherings at the men’s clubs is restricted to contacts with those of comparable manners and social position’ (p.375), and a man’s social skills and reputation go towards ensuring financial success for himself and his family. It is, the authors remark, ‘the male as representative of his family who must contend with others to win or lose a place in the sun’ (p.375).

Arensberg and Kimball’s treatments of characteristic life courses among their subjects is just one example of the incorporation of change into their overall picture. Their treatment of ‘Mobility and Continuity’ addresses this theme directly. They highlight ‘the paradox of seeming timelessness and unceasing change’, the ‘certainties’ deriving from ‘those patterns of behaviour and the social forms whose persistence is attested by a search of the past’ together with ‘evident’ ‘transformation’ (p.384). The paradox can be resolved: ‘renewal and transition are part of the same process’ (p.385). Many town families die out, move upwards to social success elsewhere, or suffer financial demise through the failure of obligations of kin and friendship (a fact which reflects the importance to survival of maintaining them). These families are replaced by contenders from the country; half the shops are held by people with fathers in other occupations.

The final chapter, ‘Reciprocals of Family and Credit’, continues to explore social interdependence, arguing that even extending credit to one’s customers is far more than a merely commercial transaction. It is ‘a social mechanism’ which stabilises relations between the shopkeeper and his customers (p.395). Debt, for Arensberg and Kimball, ties people together, forming part of a complicated system of obligation and counter-obligation which extends to many other areas, ‘including the areas of politics and religion’ (p.403). This is not identical with an exclusive stress on harmony and mutual comprehension. The authors give many examples of individuals who chafe at their fates - like the bitter young man whose father’s death has forced
him to abandon his solicitor’s training for shopkeeping (pp.388-9). They examine mutual ‘stereotypes’ and misunderstandings between town and country, the extortions of the gombeenman or the corruption of the publican who uses his office for his commercial gain (pp.407-8).

Arensberg and Kimball do not perceive the social scene as pervaded by static sameness. But they do search for repeating patterns - seeing in commercial relations a repetition, in another setting, of family relations (p.409). This ‘is of immense help in explaining persistence and change’, as practices are ‘continuously modified’ and some disappear (p.410). Those which remain, according to the authors, follow the family pattern, providing ‘the key’ to understanding ‘the gaelicizing process’ (p.410), or the nature of specifically Irish culture itself.
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