Habitus, social elevation, and the channel of shame-fear: The decision to expand Guinness advertising

Abstract

This article explains the relationship between social habitus, social mobility and shame feelings using Elias's theoretical frame of figurational sociology. Much work to date has centred on Bourdieu's theoretical formulations and while there are clear parallels with Elias, significant differences exist. Elias identified how shame functions as a key channel for the transmission of social tensions generated by the structure of social relations into the social habitus of individuals. We explain how apparently rational decision-making in organisations obscures the emotional dynamics of shame and fear connected with processes of social elevation, habitus change and shifting power relations between social classes. Our empirical case concerns the brewer Arthur Guinness & Sons Ltd and the decision in 1927 to sanction a direct advertising campaign in Britain for the first time.

Key words: Habitus, figurational sociology, Elias, shame, social elevation, advertising

Introduction

The relationship between habitus and shame has in recent times been the subject of increasing attention within sociology (Scheff, 2000; Loveday, 2016; Probyn, 2004). One aspect of this has been a focus on shame and anxiety in the social habitus during the course of social elevation (mobility) (see Friedman 2016; the work of Barrett (2016) is also relevant here though it does not relate to social mobility). We revisit this issue here but unlike Friedman and Barrett who apply Bourdieu's formulations and what he labelled 'hysteresis', we employ Elias's (2012[1939]; 2012[1991]) theoretical frame of figurational sociology to examine the relationship between shame, habitus formation and social elevation.

Despite differences in lexis and between their respective theoretical formulations there are many similarities between Bourdieu's and Elias's ideas on habitus indicative of the parallels between their wider theoretical frames (for comparisons see Paulle et al., 2011; Dunning and Hughes, 2013; Loyal, 2016)[1]. Both conceived of habitus as a set of 'second nature' social dispositions with both individual and collective characteristics. The presence of the past within the habitus is also a feature of their approaches, and both stressed how the habitus can be ill-suited or ill-adjusted to newly emerging social conditions and situations (Elias, 2012[1991]; Bourdieu, 1990). Bourdieu (1990: 62) labelled this latter aspect a 'hysteresis' effect, a structural lag concerning the habitus, whereby 'dispositions function out of phase and practices are objectively ill-adapted to the present conditions because they are objectively adjusted to conditions that no longer obtain'. Friedman (2016: 132) notes how some of Bourdieu's later work explored this issue of hysteresis or habitus clivé in relation to social mobility, suggesting that for those experiencing extreme upward mobility it could have 'profound psychic implications'.

Elias also addressed this subject but in more implicit and nuanced ways. Spanning several of his works, Elias examined the tensions aroused within the social habitus at different yet interconnected levels. Perhaps his most explicit formulation concerns what he

2

identified as the 'drag effect' between the habitus and newly emerging social conditions (Elias, 2012[1991]). Here Elias's focus primarily concerned survival units and how a social habitus moulded within a specific set of social conditions can be ill-suited to, or even slow down, a newly emerging integration, or survival, unit. He gives the example of the social habitus of Native Americans. Initially formed when the tribe generated the highest emotional charge and was the main survival unit, this social habitus was forced to navigate a social environment when the tribe was being superseded by the American state. However, in his earlier work Elias (2012[1939]) addressed more closely the issues Bourdieu raised in relation to habitus and social mobility, though Elias did not conceptualise it as a lag effect. In dealing with the 'psychic' implications for individuals during processes of rising (and failing) mobility, Elias maintained the structure of the social habitus (and conflicts within the habitus) depended to a large degree on whether a person was rising as an individual or part of a rising social group as a whole; in either instance inner (psychic) tensions of varying degrees are generated, but the latter case involves less contradictions between the older class habitus and the newer social conditions. As the collective social elevation of a class indicates a rebalancing of the power ratio in their favour, their codes of conduct require less accommodation to established upper-class codes than would be the case where individual mobility pertained. For Elias the nature of the internal conflict within the habitus is directly connected with the social demands and pressures generated by a specific structure of social relations. This also distinguishes Elias's work from Bourdieu, who has been criticised for providing little in terms of explanation of the process of habitus formation – how and why it changes or is altered (Mutch, 2007; Friedman, 2016). Elias's work, in both an empirical and theoretical sense, is very much directed at explaining and illustrating the process of habitus formation and change in the course of social mobility processes (Elias, 2012[1939]; 2012[1991]; 2013[1989]). Within this Elias developed theoretical formulations on the

relationship between habitus and the function of shame. For Elias shame functions as a key channel between the constraints and opportunities generated by social structures and their impregnation in the social habitus of individuals.

Our empirical setting concerns the well known brewing firm Arthur Guinness & Sons Ltd (now part of the global corporate Diageo) and decisions around advertising policy. Despite its cerebral contemporary association with advertising (Sibley, 1985), the first recognised official Guinness advertising campaign was launched in Scotland in 1928, followed by a large-scale campaign in England in 1929 (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998). Prior to this, not only had there been a marked reluctance to sanction advertising campaigns, there was in fact considerable antipathy by some senior management towards the practice – in particular from Edward Cecil Guinness (great grandson of the company's founder Arthur Guinness) and both managing director and chairman of the company at various periods between 1886 and 1927.

In August 1927 the board agreed for the first time since the brewery's foundation in 1759 to officially sanction a direct advertising campaign in Britain (Guinness, 1927). Using this decision as an illustrative example, we explain how strategic decision-making is connected with the psychic and emotional consequences which occur within the habitus during processes of social elevation. We focus on two of the key individuals involved: Edward Cecil Guinness who is viewed as the main barrier to direct advertising; and, Charles Joseph (CJ) Newbold, a managing director and a member of the board at the time of the decision, regularly identified as leading the push for a more extensive approach to advertising (Dennison & MacDonagh, 1998). In a previous paper (Connolly and Dolan, 2017) we explained how the change in policy was interconnected with the changing power balance between the landed classes (the aristocracy and gentry) and the bourgeoisie in Britain. We argued that a shift in the power balance between these social groups facilitated a change in

the social habitus of those comprising both the bourgeoisie and landed classes in which advertising gradually lost much of the stigma previously attached to it. Certainly we retrace, and expand, some of this ground here. Yet, our primary focus in this paper is theoretically-empirically explaining how fear and shame function as a crucial channel through which the structure of society is transmitted to the individual.

The paper begins with an overview of Elias's theoretical framework and his treatment of habitus and shame. We then sketch a brief overview of our data sources followed by the exposition of the empirical case, explaining how habitus formation and change is connected with the interrelationship between social and psychic structures. Finally, our conclusion focuses on the connection between the channel of shame and social interdependency.

Figurational sociology, habitus and shame habitus

The central concepts in Elias's theoretical approach are that of figuration and process. By figuration he meant a fluid network of interdependent people (Elias, 2012[1970]). Equally, incorporated within this conception of people in interdependence is the related concept of power which mirrors the structure of interdependence between people. Power and dependency ratios run in parallel and are always in process. These concepts are also central in comprehending Elias's theory on social habitus formation. Elias conceived of social habitus as both collective, in that it reflects characteristics we share with others, and individual, characteristics somewhat unique to each individual, but always shaped through relations with others (Elias, 2010[1987]). For Elias, habitus formation and change (the habitus is processual) is shaped by the figurations a person comprises with other people from the

moment they are born and on a continuous basis thereafter. Furthermore, as Elias argued, habitus formation and change has a temporal dimension in that change needs to be examined historically over long time periods.

As figurations, and an individual's position within them, change a person's habitus must navigate through and adjust to new pressures, constraints, opportunities, feelings and emotional charges. Some of these constraints and pressures tend to be more overtly experienced (and more obvious to the individual) through the everyday relationships with face-to-face others, such as when parents prohibit their children from watching television after a certain time, or when employees are told by their boss to stay working late. However, these pressures and constraints emanate from a broader dynamic, and from more 'indirect' chains of interdependencies in which individuals are enmeshed, which are much less obvious to people. For instance, the duties many twenty-first century men take on in the home or in relation to caring for children may not be directly experienced as a manifestation of a change in the structure of interdependences and in the corresponding power ratio between men and women as distinct social groups. Neither is habitus formation always a smooth or unproblematic process for individuals. The habitus can be ill-suited to adjusting to new social standards, or social orders, and feelings of resentment, anger and frustration can develop. While this process, the shaping of habitus, is significantly formed during childhood, attaining a level of solidity, it remains mutable, constantly open to being re-shaped through ongoing interdependencies at different levels of social integration.

Elias's (2012[1939]) contention is that changes in the overall structure of human relations are directly related to changes in habitus – the relationship between social and psychic processes. Elias showed how social constraints relating to eating, defecating and social etiquette more generally were gradually transformed into self-controls, becoming internalised to the extent they are felt as 'second nature', part of the habitus. Elias explains

how children are taught mainly at first by their parents through a combination of instruction, coaxing and discipline to exert the necessary levels of restraint and foresight in relation to these bodily functions and other social manners. Indeed, he also illustrates how these changes formed part of a long-term, though certainly nonlinear, pattern which he labelled a civilising process. By this he meant a growing social constraint toward self-restraint, and an advance in the threshold of repugnance towards violence and other forms of aggressiveness and social indiscipline. He connected these developments to the emergence of monopoly organisations for the control of violence (and taxation) and an ever expanding division of functions which generated a social context in which increasing numbers of people became more dependent on one another. This in turn induces a more pacified set of social relations sustained by a specific balance of both social and self-restraints.

The present study takes as its starting point that individual structures and social structures 'develop in an indissoluble interrelationship' (Elias 2012[1939]: 499). One of the most important channels through which the structure of society is transmitted to individual psychological functions is through fear. Fears, of varying kinds, become instilled – and one learns to develop new or greater levels of self-control to prevent a lapse in behaviour owing to these fears. On occasions that breakdowns or lapses in the control of behaviour occur, they result in shame, embarrassment or punishment. However, crucially, as Elias (2012[1939]: 486) puts it:

Shame, fear of war and fear of God, guilt, fear of punishment or of loss of social prestige, a man's fear of himself, of being overcome by his own affective impulses, all these are directly or indirectly induced in a person by other people.

As such, to comprehend fully Elias's theory we need to see people as comprising figurations. This is the starting point for understanding how fear functions as a channel between the constraints generated by social structures and their impregnation in individuals. As Elias (2012[1939]: 486) suggested, the constraints to which one is subject, and the fears corresponding to them, 'are in their character, their strength and structure decisively determined by the particular forces engendered by the structure of our society'. Consequently, it is imperative to understand that an Eliasian approach conceives of people as always in interdependence with others. It is not the case of the individual first existing and then becoming interdependent with others. There is no separation between 'individual' and their 'environment'. For Elias (2012[1939]: 499) the dualisms – individual/society; agency/structure; micro/macro – pervading sociology are flawed in the sense that these concepts 'do not relate to two objects existing separately but to different yet inseparable aspects of the same human beings, and that both aspects (and human beings in general) are normally involved in structural transformation.'

Elias always saw people as capable of making choices, decisions or taking action. However, he saw this taking place against the background of people bonded to others through various chains of interdependencies – each of whom is also motivated to pursue particular goals and undertake specific actions with the aim of achieving them. Consequently, each individual, to varying degrees, is constrained and enabled by the structure of the figuration they form with others, and their position within it, as well as the social fund of knowledge, values and means of orientation that pass from generation to generation, undergoing change in the course of largely unplanned figurational development. Choice, therefore, is itself historically shaped for the individual in social contexts and situations requiring the exercise of such choice.

Data sources and methods

The data was primarily based on existing historiographic accounts of the Guinness company (see Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998; Davies, 1999; Hughes, 2006; Sibley, 1985) and related monographs and biographies of the Guinness family and those comprising it over the generations (see Mullally, 1981; Martelli, 1956; McGuire and Quinn, 2009; Bielenberg, 2002/2003). This was supplemented by an examination of various organisational files at the Guinness Archive in St. James' Gate, Dublin, Ireland[2] covering the period 1900 to 1960. We also examined national census data and the national archives for both Britain and Ireland to obtain further data concerning the social strata of various members of the Guinness board of management over the decades. Further data sources included; social histories of the brewing industry in Ireland, Britain and other European and non-European nation states; Irish and British newspapers; histories of alcohol – concerning both its production and consumption; histories and sociological studies of advertising; and sociological and historical manuscripts concerning social, economic and political changes in Ireland and Britain.

Data analysis was theory guided though this involved an iterative element between the data, the emerging interpretation and the wider theoretical frame of figurational sociology (for more detailed accounts and discussions of methods see Elias, (2007[1987]) and Kilminster, (2007)).We were of course considerably reliant on both primary historical sources and those mediated by other historians. To ensure greater trustworthiness in these accounts we sought multiple sources to corroborate key empirical facts. The interplay between theory and data also meant we asked questions of the framework and what it implied in terms of our data – this was not the mere unquestioning application of Elias's theory.

Advertising policy at Arthur Guinness & Sons 1880–1928

Guinness was first established as a brewing house in 1759 by Arthur Guinness following his purchase of a then defunct brewery on the site of St. James' Gate, Dublin (Hughes, 2006). Since its emergence as a brewer for porter[3] it gradually grew to become not only the dominant brewery in Ireland, and a leading brewing house in the British market, but one of the largest in the world by the 1880s (Gourvish and Wilson, 1994: 99, 103). Initially run as a family enterprise, it was incorporated as a public limited company in 1886 (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998).

Despite the fact that advertising was already an established, and growing, practice in several European countries, management at Guinness did not directly initiate or financially support promotional campaigns in newspapers, bill posts or hoardings. Notwithstanding, it would be remiss to suggest that the promotion and advertising of Guinness products was not occurring at that time. However, this activity was instigated and undertaken by functionaries in other commercial organisations involved in the wider chain of beer distribution (Hughes, 2006). Indeed, partly as a consequence of this, the Guinness 'brand' was already well established amongst the drinking population in both Ireland and Britain by the 1880s (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998).

The reluctance to sanction direct advertising principally endured until the late 1920s when the first official Guinness advertising campaign was launched in Britain. In the intervening years senior management at Guinness, on numerous occasions, declared that Guinness did not advertise (see Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998: 75). This policy was also in marked contrast to several of its direct competitors (Gourvish and Wilson, 1994: 300). The pressure and appeals for advertising often emanated from the management of export bottling

firms who sold Guinness in international markets (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998). Despite the rejection of these requests some appeals were occasionally acceded to. For instance, in 1897 Guinness management agreed to support advertising in America with a budget of £1,000 (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998: 68). Nonetheless there remained a reluctance to adopt a more expansive approach to advertising; in 1904 recommendations to support advertising in Australia were rejected by the board. So despite the occasional concession of advertising allowances it was not a formal policy or strategy and as late as 1909 following a request for further advertising supports CD La Touche (managing director at Guinness between 1902 and 1913) informed the managing director of Reads Bottlers: '"we never advertise in this or any other way"' (cited in Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998: 72).

This policy of advertising from a distance – through Guinness's intermediaries –, and however informal and haphazard, persisted for well over a century. Post the incorporation it was sustained by various managing directors and boards, but principally by Edward Cecil Guinness. He became sole proprietor of the company in 1876. After the incorporation, he retained a considerable equity holding and remained on the board; his position oscillating between managing director and chairman until his death in 1927. This, his lineage within the company and his wider social status in both Dublin and London society, ensured that few significant managerial decisions occurred without his approval.

The landed classes–bourgeoisie figuration in Britain

As noted above the most fervent opposition to the direct advertising of Guinness products emanated from Edward Cecil Guinness. Central in understanding his feelings and behaviour in respect of advertising is the structure of dynamic class relations in Britain over the course of the nineteenth century (see Connolly and Dolan, 2017). By the 1850s increasing

industrialisation in Britain, and trade and commerce connected with this, had facilitated an advance in the power chances of the bourgeoisie relative to the established aristocracy and gentry (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). This was a complex and uneven process, generating conflicting and ambivalent feelings for both members of the landed classes (aristocracy and gentry) and the bourgeoisie. Status competition between and within both cohorts intensified as did the inner anxieties felt by many of those comprising the aristocracy and rising bourgeoisie. For the aristocracy, still the elite social group in Britain, the extent of the rise of several members of the elite bourgeoisie, which had accelerated due to increased industrialisation, urbanisation and commercialisation in the first half of the nineteenth century, amplified the reality of their declining status and the possible ramifications of this for them. This initially provoked a strong push for social distance from the bourgeoisie and the stigmatisation of bourgeois ways of life, including the source of bourgeois power – commerce. This desire for social distance was soon moderated as the landed classes came to realise that their dependence on bourgeois wealth required a less patronising attitude to middle-class practices and sensibilities. Some of the more hostile attitudes held by members of the aristocracy had by the late 1800s begun to recede; though they did not disappear entirely. Cain and Hopkins (1986: 509) note that even after the 1850s 'manufacturers who sought prestige and authority often had to adapt to gentlemanly ideas' and in some cases 'only by abandoning the attitudes or even the occupations which had brought them original success'.

Furthermore, despite the more symmetrical power balance, the aristocracy continued to be a reference group for members of the bourgeoisie. The landed classes still retained the social function of integrating the bourgeoisie into a 'high society' still dominated by the nobility. It was this specific structure that led to a complex process of gradual value fusion, a feature of which was the emulation of aristocratic values and behaviours by an aspiring high

bourgeoisie. Some brewers, like other businessmen, took on many of the practices, etiquette and values of the aristocracy while simultaneously suppressing, masking or downplaying aspects of the source of their social advancement – commerce (Martelli, 1956; Gourvish and Wilson, 1994). The other side of the coin was that aspects of commerce were becoming increasingly acceptable to the aristocracy and gentry and thus considered a more gentlemanly practice (see Thompson, 1985).

From the 1870s onwards the power differential between them declined even further, a feature of which was the greater integration and assimilation of both groups (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). This was neither a smooth nor harmonious process. Many members of the landed classes were still concerned with social demarcation. Consequently, as Gutzke (1984) notes, brewers, and businessmen more generally, could still encounter aristocratic efforts to sabotage their social ambitions. The 'gentlemanly' ideal was only slowly coming to include greater aspects of commerce and commercial practices. So while the process of dignifying commerce had advanced (Henderson, 2017) certain aspects of it had yet to be brought fully under the veil of dignified behaviour. Advertising, it would seem, was one such practice. Several business historians have noted the reluctance of some business owners to advertise, or the tendency to adopt a more cautious approach towards it, in the late nineteenth century (see Church, 2000; Reinarz, 2007). While this reluctance can in some cases be attributed to unease about the efficacy of advertising it was also connected to concerns as to whether advertising was a dignified practice – an activity a gentleman could engage in without losing status and self-respect. Indeed such concerns appeared in numerous newspaper reports at the time (See *Huddersfield Daily Chronicle*, 24 July, 1899, p. 4; *Burnley News*, 25 March, 1916, p. 9; *Northern Daily Mail*, 30 April, 1925, p. 8; *The Evening Telegraph and Star*, 31 March, 1911, p. 5). This illustrates how the process of dignifying commercial life was far from complete. Furthermore, it reflected the asymmetrical relation between the landed classes and

the middle classes and to a degree the capacity of the landed classes to still influence the delineation of various commercial practices as socially contaminated or dignified. We contend that this was the wider social context which shaped Edward Cecil Guinness's attitude to advertising.

Social structure, social rising and the channel of fear: The habitus of Edward Cecil Guinness

Edward Cecil's ancestral family, and his own individual, social ascent mirrors somewhat the social rise of the bourgeoisie more generally over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In terms of lineage, the Guinness family were originally bourgeois (Mullally, 1981). Over the generations, up to and including Edward Cecil and his siblings, the family remained socially ambitious, and gradually became increasingly integrated into the higher tiers of Irish and British society (Edward Cecil would later become part of the reconfigured social elite involving both members of the older aristocracy and the high bourgeoisie in Britain). Born in Ireland in 1847, Edward Cecil's social learning as a child was instilled by his parents who were socially ambitious and who saw the aristocracy as the benchmark of high society (Bielenberg, 2002/2003). His father (Benjamin Lee) had purchased several Dublin residences and a country estate in Ireland (Bielenberg, 2002/2003) – an illustration of how the aristocracy functioned as reference group for the aspiring and wealthy bourgeoisie (see Thompson, 1985). Yet the rise of the Guinness family was indicative of how the boundaries of elite British society had widened (downwards). The very fact that a family from 'trade' could seek to (and did) enter such circles illustrates the accommodation being forced on the landed classes as result of the more equal power relations

then pertaining (in the past some were forced to abandon industrial and commercial occupations).

Despite the relative success of their parents in ascending the social hierarchy both Edward Cecil and his brother Arthur would come to express a similar level of social ambition. Elias (2012[1939]) argues that parental fears about whether a child can attain the standard of conduct, or a higher standard, necessary to main or increase the prestige of a family remain particularly strong amongst those drawn from the middle classes ambitious for social climbing. These fears are also transmitted to the child, he argued.

As the aristocracy in Britain came under increasing pressure as a social group in the late nineteenth century status exclusiveness intensified as a result (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). This generated considerable pressures and constraints for those born outside the nobility keen to rise further up the social ladder. For instance, in the case of the Guinness family, Arthur actually withdrew from the 'trade' in 1876. That he sought to do so would appear to be connected to the class tensions referred to above which were interwoven with, and overlapped, his education and marriage. Biographers have noted the hostility of his wife Olivia, the daughter of the 3rd Earl of Bantry, to his involvement and association with 'trade' (see Mullally, 1981). Prior to his formal withdrawal, Arthur had taken only limited interest and while this situation may have been influenced by his wife's feelings, we argue that his schooling, and the timing of it, also contributed. Arthur attended Eton, one of the most elite and prestigious public schools (in Britain) in the mid-1850s at a time of rising class tensions between members of the ascending bourgeoisie and landed classes. At Eton the proportion of boys who came from titled families remained relatively high in comparison with other public schools at a time of mounting hostility towards the middle classes (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). It is likely that this enmity was expressed at Eton by those he socially aspired to. Combined with the fact that his early childhood had been shaped in an environment in which

social elevation was desired and the aristocracy remained the central point of reference, it meant he was probably somewhat embarrassed and anxious by the association with the brewery.

Edward Cecil experienced a largely similar childhood, though significantly he did not attend Eton, instead going to work in the brewery from the age of 15. So while holding similar aspirations in terms of social elevation to his brother, it is more likely that his insecurity around involvement in the business was perhaps more muted in comparison with his brother. Though, as we illustrate below, a level of social insecurity and anxiety existed nonetheless (see also Mullally, 1981: 60), sustained by the wider tensions between the rising middle classes and the established landed classes.

Certainly by the time Edward Cecil had entered adulthood and become proprietor of Guinness, the power ratio between the landed classes and bourgeoisie had become more even (though it was still unequal), with bourgeois values and mores more acceptable and increasingly accommodated within the gentlemanly ideal of the upper classes. For instance, Edward Cecil could aspire to entry to the highest social circles despite his commercial origins and his continued association with 'trade'. Yet he remained very dependent on the aristocracy owning to their established (though declining) social position; they still retained a capacity to block entry to elite social circles. And despite the social ascent and wealth that he, and the family, had attained up to this, the strength of Edward Cecil's desire for further social elevation was considerable. The Irish angle also contributed to this though not in the sense of nationality, but rather socio-geographical location. Although the Guinness family had ascended the ranks of Anglo-Irish society in Dublin by the 1870s, London was the apex of high society – the seat of the British monarchy and the wider establishment (nobility) connected with this – and both Edward Cecil and his wife were keen to attain the social prestige conferred by entry into this elite circle (Martelli, 1956; Bielenberg, 2002/2003).

16

Bielenberg maintains that Edward Cecil's wider social and political activities and the concentration of his philanthropic effort on London rather than Dublin was part of his calculated effort to ascend the social ranks there. London society remained the pinnacle with inclusion far from guaranteed. The purchase and expansion of his estate in England and the social activities surrounding it took place in this context. This too is an illustration of how the aristocracy still remained one of the most significant reference groups for members of the rising middle classes. It induced a pressure to conform to the social standards and etiquette set by the aristocracy, certainly amongst those keen to rise up the social ladder. They sought to acquire a lifestyle commensurate with these social aspirations including the purchase of estates and the conferring of titles. Edward Cecil was the perfect example of this. He largely follows the ways and mores of the established group and identifies with them.

At the same time, it is this very desire for social accent, his identification with the aristocracy, and the social context in which it is played out, that generates a certain fear and anxiety around his background and the source of his wealth – commerce – a position previously noted by biographers (see Mullally, 1981: 60-61). That the origins of his wealth, and the material and social trappings it permitted, are so clearly connected with the business of brewing remain a source of insecurity most especially when his desires for further social elevation were so strong.

We contend that a further manifestation of this insecurity was his reluctance to permit a more expansive and direct approach to advertising by the company that bore his name (see also Connolly and Dolan, 2017). Even by the early twentieth century, on the back of commercial pressures, when others comprising the board and the company more generally were advocating for more extensive promotional activity he sought to moderate it. For instance, when he finally acquiesced to advertising in Belgium in 1910 he did so on the basis that he had no 'objection to advertising there', as opposed to England, while noting 'the need

for dignity in advertising' and that the advertisements should appear to emanate from intermediaries rather than directly from Guinness (Hughes, 2006: 30). In the words of Elias (2012[1939]) it was pushed 'behind the scenes'; Belgium was distant from his social circles and the association with advertising was further masked by making it appear to stem from local intermediaries. Even then, the appeal for 'dignity' indicates he remained somewhat insecure about this 'distant' act of advertising due to its potential to still cause personal embarrassment or to perhaps even damage his social standing amongst the elite (aristocratic) circles he frequented. This concern stemmed not only from the fact that an association with advertising could perhaps cause embarrassment but also from the anxiety generated by his bourgeois origins and the threat it presented for him. Indeed, he took this position at a time when he had become even more integrated into the ranks of a re-configured social elite. For instance, he had received a peerage (becoming Lord Iveagh) by then, and both the King (of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland), and Prince of Wales, were regular visitors to his Elveden estate in England (see Bielenberg, 2002/2003).

We contend that it is exactly this level of social accent and its timing that sustain his ambivalence towards advertising. Given the extent of this social elevation a corresponding fear of social falling could run in tandem with this (Wouters, 2007). Despite the fact that a reconstituted social elite comprising the upper bourgeoisie and aristocracy was taking hold, status-exclusive behaviour remained intense both between and within the social classes (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). In that regard, it is not surprising that such insecurities could be invoked. As Wouters (2007) notes the appeal to status anxiety remained quite strong in England even by 1900.

In such a social climate Edward Cecil's social origins and the source of his accent – commerce – could still generate a level of shame. As Elias (2012[1939]: 457) explains, the feeling of shame-fear results from 'defencelessness against the superiority of others' and,

18

this defencelessness results from the fact that the people whose
superiority one fears are in accord with one's own superego, with the agency of
self-restraint implanted in the individual by others on whom one is dependent,
who possessed power and superiority over him.

His place amongst the social elite of British society was dependent on the elite of the
aristocracy and it was in that sense he remained somewhat socially insecure given his
commercial and bourgeois associations. We argue that it also explains his ambivalence
towards advertising – his pronouncements for 'dignity' in advertising, and his efforts to mask
associations between Guinness and advertising, symbolise both the desire to identify with
aristocratic values and the insecurities that underpinned it. They were no different than his
efforts to imitate the lifestyle and tastes of the aristocracy, to mould himself and his social
world, to a certain degree, according to aristocratic models (see Bielenberg 2002/2003).

That Edward Cecil retained this status insecurity, even at a time when the commercial
classes were so clearly rising, illustrates the degree that the external constraints and pressures
exerted by the aristocracy had come to be internalised and accepted by him. The anxiety
exists because in this social context an association with commerce has the potential to
generate shame and because the behaviour or association one is ashamed of brings one into
'conflict with a part of oneself that represents this social opinion' (Mennell, 1998: 105)
within oneself. Fear of a loss of respectability and of social standing (internally) is reflected
(externally) in concerns about advertising and what it expressed – of being of the bourgeoisie.
Deep psychic insecurities must be fenced off and are mirrored by a desire to fence of those
social activities which threaten the psyche (Wouters, 2007). Thus, Edward Cecil sought to
block these psychic fears (internally) by blocking advertising (externally). While these fears

and insecurities emanate (or appear to) from deep 'inside' the individual, they are, as Elias explained, fears generated by other people – through the figurations (of different kinds) that people comprise.

Given the different figurations people comprise the pressure and constraints can differ, even conflict. In that regard, Edward Cecil's habitus also expressed, and was shaped by, the commercial figurations he comprised since his teenage years. Thus, fears over social status and how commercial associations might impede this stood, paradoxically, alongside the fear of 'commercial' failure (as measured by where the company stood in relation to its competitors). Edward Cecil's status, both financial and social was interwoven with Guinness's commercial position. It is very clear from both biographer accounts, and documents in the Guinness archive, of Edwards Cecil's commitment to further the success and position of the Guinness company as a commercial entity. Equally, the income generated through the brewery sustained the lavish lifestyle that underpinned his integration into the highest aristocratic circles. Guinness was one of the leading breweries in Britain (and the world). This position and the prestige it generated was something that Edward Cecil wished to maintain and strengthen. As such, the emerging commercial pressures that emanated from the intensified competitive relations within the brewing figuration (see Connolly, 2017) and the social fears connected with it for Edward Cecil, also penetrated this habitus. And his habitus was receptive to these fears giving his 'commercial' socialisation during his youth. Failure to partake in promotional practices might jeopardise the commercial success of Guinness and the prestige and social rewards that went with this. As such, he experienced conflicting emotional pulls. His habitus developed in the context of different and at times contradictory social interdependencies. That professional and financial success, in parallel with the rise of the bourgeoisie, increasingly became an accepted marker of social prestige – even amongst the landed classes – certainly assuaged these contradictory tensions post 1900.

20

Advertising and the habitus of CJ Newbold

 CJ Newbold was of solid middle class origins and has been identified as one of the strongest advocates of greater advertising at Guinness in the late 1920s. Newbold had long been open to the use of advertising having previously recommended supporting advertising campaigns in Belgium in 1910 (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998: 74). In 1926 and early 1927 Newbold had conducted an analysis of Guinness trade in Britain. In his subsequent report to the board (in February 1927) he advised, amongst other recommendations, that a policy of advertising be adopted. However, his proposal for advertising was roundly rejected in May 1927. With the continuing decline of the Scottish trade becoming even more apparent to senior management at Guinness Newbold produced another report in June 1927 in which he again pressed for a considerable advertising campaign. This was finally acceded to by the board (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998: 173–174). Newbold had proposed 'the appointment of two new members of staff to look after advertising; that Guinness advertise on their own vehicles', and use 'slate tablets outside public houses' adding that these were dignified in appearance (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998: 175). While this allusion to dignity is perhaps suggestive of an acknowledgment of Edward Cecil's previous misgivings, and his organisational position, social position and status it also suggests that process of bringing advertising practice under the veil of dignified behaviour was far from complete even by the late 1920s.

Newbold joined the company as a brewer in 1904 rising to become a member of the board in 1923 (he would later become managing director in 1941). Born into a well-to-do bourgeois family in 1881, his father was a director of the Mexican Railway Company of London and the home had several servants. He was educated at the English public school

Uppingham and later attended Cambridge University in 1900. He joined Arthur Guinness &
Co. Ltd in 1904 as a junior brewer, rising to become a member of the board as a managing
director in 1923. He was decorated during the First World War, for which he volunteered and
in which he became a Lieutenant-colonel[4]. His social origins and the timing of his schooling
and later employment are significant. By the time he had entered Uppingham, the power ratio
between the middle classes and aristocracy had become more equal; the middle classes had
risen further as a social group. Consequently, bourgeois values and interests were now of
higher value within such schools and indeed within society more broadly; a situation that
progressed further by the 1920s (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). Consequently, his social
habitus at an early age was penetrated more comprehensively and securely by bourgeoisie
values and this continued through to his employment when the 'gentlemanly' ideal comprised
more of the interests and mores of the bourgeoisie.

Equally, his social circles (and aspirations) were more bourgeois in comparison with
Edward Cecil who had not only gained access, but was gradually integrated, into the nobility.
Of course the difference in wealth played a role in their power chances and the related
opportunities for social rising (see Thompson, 1985). Although Newbold's social habitus was
'purer' bourgeoisie it would be wrong to suggest that he was devoid of, or unaffected by,
aristocratic influences – a reflection of the percolation downwards of aristocratic values. As
Elias (2012[1939]: 469) suggested, it was in England 'despite the rise of bourgeois elements,
aristocratic social formations remained longest and most vigorously alive'. Indeed,
Newbold's interests and values betray such influences though clearly to a much lesser degree
than Edward Cecil. He embraced hunting, and entered the officer class of the British army
during the war – both traditional aspects of life associated with the landed classes. His
participation in amateur rugby Union – he was capped six times as an England rugby
international in the early 1900s – also suggests that he identified strongly with the upper

classes and members of the middle classes aligned with them. By the turn of the nineteenth century the sport of rugby union had begun to rise in Britain's status hierarchy of sports. The sport came to be regarded by members of the upper classes and sections of the middle classes as more in keeping with the expected behavioural standards of a 'gentleman' (Dunning and Sheard, 1979).

By the 1920s the meaning and practices connected with gentlemanly behaviour had changed significantly. Bourgeois values and interests now played a greater part in the social mores associated with the gentlemanly ideal. Commerce had become a more dignified practice and, corresponding with this, advertising had lost much of the stigma attached to it. It is this wider social dynamic that is also crucial in explaining why Edward Cecil by this time was willing to accede to direct advertising. As advertising was now less likely to cause social embarrassment, and/or generate shame feelings, the fears within people concerning the possible loss of social standing, respect and, perhaps, one's meaning in life recede or disappear. Yet this change in the gentlemanly ideal was relatively nascent and fragile as suggested by the sensitivity that still existed around advertising – the need to differentiate between forms of 'dignified' and 'undignified' advertising.

Conclusion

In mobilising Elias's approach we have sought to demonstrate the importance of the channel of shame and fear in connecting social and psychic processes. Many studies explicitly imply a relationship between social structures and psychic dispositions but the theoretical formulations as to how this occurs is lacking (e.g. Hayward, 2013). Relations at a higher tier of social integration shape, and are embodied in, lower tier relations such as face-

to-face relations with shame-fear functioning as one of the important channels through which this takes place. The social habitus of individuals comes to embody the shifting power balances between groups at the higher levels of social integration such as between social class groups, genders, national groupings, and parents and children. As the power relations change (and they are always in process) particular practices and levels of emotional control are reframed in terms of meaning and social expectations. Changes in the habitus occurs in conjunction with rising tensions, and the specific structure of power relations connected with this, between groups, and indeed between the people comprising individual groups. The mechanism of shame-fear functions as a channel but it is fuelled by the changing structure of social relations. Changing structures exacerbate uncertainty and anxiety, and therefore feelings of fear and anticipated shame of being not only insufficiently, but also excessively, deferential to other people and prevailing standards of conduct. Furthermore, that it functions effectively as a channel is also an indication of the type and strength of the social interdependence between groups. Only in a situation where the interdependency ties binding the aristocracy and bourgeoisie had become so strong could the activities of one group generate such anxiety for the other.

In attempting to understand and explain the anxieties and shame people experience during processes of social rising (or falling) we need to consider how, and in what ways, they are bound into the structure of social relations and how this has changed over time. Certainly the work of Freidman and Barrett can illustrate where and how shame, embarrassment or anxiety is aroused when the habitus is not in harmony with new social conditions, but why specific issues are the cause of embarrassment or become the source of shame for specific people remains somewhat unanswered. The type of psychic insecurities and anxieties that are experienced within the habitus during processes of social mobility, or in other situations, is always in relation to structure of social relations (and their socio-historical development).

References

Barrett T. (2016). Bourdieu, Hysteresis, and Shame: Spinal Cord Injury and the Gendered Habitus. *Men and Masculinities*, 1–21.

Bielenberg, A. (2002/2003). Late Victorian Elite Formation and Philanthrophy: The Making of Edward Guinness. *Studia Hibernica* 32: 133–154.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cain, P.J. & Hopkins, A.G. (1986). Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Expansion Overseas I. The Old Colonial System. *Economic History Review, New Series*, 39, 501–525.

Connolly, J. and Dolan, P. (2017). Social Class Tensions, Habitus and the Advertising of Guinness. *Sociological Review*, 65, 1, 100–116.

Connolly, J. (2017) Figurational Dynamics and the Function of Advertising at Arthur Guiness & Sons Ltd, 1876–1960. In; Connolly, J. and Dolan, P. (eds) *The Social Organisation of Marketing*. Palgrave Macmillan, 61–92.Church, R. (2000). Advertising Consumer Goods in Nineteenth-century Britain: Reinterpretations. *Economic History Review*, LIII, 621–645.

Davies, J. (1999). *The Book of Guinness Advertising,* London: Guinness Records.

Henderson, C.D. (2017). On Bourgeois Dignity. Making the Self-made Man. In: Debes, R. (ed) *Dignity. A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 269-289.

Dennison, S. R. & MacDonagh, O. (1998). *Guinness 1886–1939,* Cork: Cork University Press.

Dunning, E. (2005). Figurational/Process-sociological notes on Loïc Waquant's *Body and Soul*. *Qualitative Sociology*, 28, 171–177.

Dunning, E. & Hughes, J. (2013). *Norbert Elias and Modern Sociology,* London: Bloomsbury.

Dunning, E. & Sheard, K. (1979). *Barbarians, Gentlemen & Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football,* Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Elias, N. (2007[1987]). *Involvement and Detachment,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Elias, N. (2010[1987]). *The Society of Individuals,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Elias, N. (2012[1939]). *On the Process of Civilisation. Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Elias N. (2012[1970]). *What is Sociology?,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Elias, N. (2012[1991]). *The Society of Individuals,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Elias, N. (2013[1989]). *Studies on the Germans,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Friedman, S. (2016). Habitus Clivé and the Emotional Imprint of Social Mobility. *The Sociological Review*, 64, 129–147.

Gourvish, T.R. & Wilson, R.G. (1994). *The British Brewing Industry 1930-1980,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guinness (1927). Company Secretary Trade Papers. *Guinness Archive.* Dublin [GDBC005.02.050003.15].

Gutzke, D. W. (1984). The Social Status of Landed Brewers in Britain since 1840. *Histoire sociale - Social History*, XVII, 93–113.

Hayward, K. (2013). 'Life Stage Dissolution' in Anglo-American Advertising and Popular Culture: Kidults, Lil' Britneys and Middle Youths. *The Sociological Review*, 61, 525–548.

Hughes, D. (2006). *"A Bottle of Guinness please". The Colourful History of Guinness,* Wokingham: Phimboy.

Kilminster, R. (2007). *Norbert Elias. Post-philosophical Sociology,* Oxon: Routledge.

Loveday, V. (2016). Embodying Deficiency through 'Affective Practice': Shame, Relationality, and the Lived Experience of Social Class and Gender in Higher Education. *Sociology*, 50, 1140–1155.

Loyal, S. (2016) Bourdieu on the State: An Eliasian Critique. *Human Figurations*, 5.

Martelli, G. (1956). *Man of his Time, A Life of the first Earl of Iveagh* London: Tanner and Butler.

McGuire, J. & Quinn, J. (2009). Dictionary of Irish Biography. From the earliest times to the year 2002 . Royal Irish Academy and Cambridge University Press.

Mennell, S. (1998). *Norbert Elias: An Introduction,* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Mullally, F. (1981). *The Silver Salver. The Story of the Guinness Family,* London: Granada.

Mutch, A. (2007). Reflexivity and the Institutional Entrepreneur: A Historical Exploration. *Organization Studies*, 28, 1123–1140.

Paulle, B., van Heerikhuizen, B. & Emirbayer, M. (2011). Elias and Bourdieu. In: Susen, Simon & Trurner, Bryan (eds) *The Legacy of Pierre Bourdieu: Critical Essays.* London: Anthem Press, 145–172.

Probyn, E. (2004). Shame in the Habitus. *The Sociological Review*, 52, 224–248.

Reinarz, J. (2007). Promoting the Pint: Ale and Advertising in Late Victorian and Edwardian England. *Social History of Alcohol and Drugs*, 22, 26–44.

Scheff, T. (2000). Shame and the Social Bond: A Sociological Theory. *Sociological Theory*, 18, 84–99.

Sibley, B. (1985). *The Book of Guinness Advertising,* London: Guinness Superlatives Ltd.

Thompson, M. (1985) The Landed Aristocracy and Business Elites in Victorian Britain. In:

Les noblesses européennes au XIXe siècle. Actes du colloque de Rome, 21-23

novembre 1985. Rome : École Française de Rome, 1988, 267–279

Wouters, C. (2007). *Informalization. Manners & Emotions since 1890,* London: Sage.

---

[1] See also Dunning (2005) for a comparison between Elias's and Bourdieu's approaches.

[2] Until 1920 Ireland was part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Following the War of Independence and a Treaty with Britain, Ireland was partitioned with Dublin the capital of the new Free State comprising 26 counties (known as the Republic of Ireland from 1949). The six north eastern counties remained under the jurisdiction of Britain and became known as Northern Ireland.

[3] Porter, or stout as it is also known is, a dark beverage, brewed with soft water from brown malt, with a fairly bitter taste (Dennison and MacDonagh, 1998).

[4] Much of the information on CJ Newbold's background was obtained from the following sources: the Guinness Archive; Obituary in *Journal of Brewing Society* (Jan-Feb, 1947), pp. 6–8; the UK Census 1891.