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PREFACE

The people of Gosforth found it difficult to understand why I had chosen their parish. The University of Wales, where I was working at the time, seemed to them remote, if indeed it existed at all. The answer is that I wished to carry out a study of a parish in North-Western England; a preliminary survey in West Cumberland showed that Gosforth was one of three parishes which were of the size of population and of a sufficiently remote location to seem worthy of full-time study over a period of about eighteen months. Gosforth was finally chosen because of its long history and because it contained both a village and scattered farms. The field-work took place between July 1950 and February 1952, and further field-work was carried out in the summer of 1953.

The success of the study is due in very large measure to the kindness and co-operation of the Gosforth folk. More often than not I arrived at their homes at the most inconvenient time; many of my questions were extremely personal; many of my requests for information involved considerable work. Throughout my stay, however, I found the hospitality which is so important and attractive a characteristic of the area. A great many people went to a great deal of trouble to help in the investigation. In particular I should like to thank Mr. Will Wilson, the Headmaster of Gosforth School, Mr. Harry Simpson, the Parish Clerk, Mr. Tom Moore, Mr. Matthew Singleton, Mr. Jacob Williamson and Mr. William Poole.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to my former teacher Mr. Alwyn D. Rees of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. His teaching first aroused my interest in rural sociology and his advice was of immeasurable help during the field-work and the analysis. Also I should like to thank Professor Shils of Chicago, Professor Homans of Harvard and Professor Gluckman of Manchester for their help and encouragement.
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Most of all I record my gratitude to my wife, who made the field-work possible. Her help and encouragement have been invaluable always.

University College of North Staffordshire.
October 1955

W. M. WILLIAMS
INTRODUCTION

The civil parish of Gosforth, covering an area of just over eleven square miles, lies on the western fringe of the Lakeland fells of Cumberland. About two miles from its western boundary is the Irish Sea, while to the north and east stand the moorlands and peaks of Copeland Forest and Eskdale, uninhabited save for hardy flocks of Herdwick sheep. The landscape of the parish reflects its position between the Lakeland hills and the undulating coastal plain, which extends from Millom in the extreme south of the county to Carlisle in the north. The southern half of Gosforth is a gently undulating plain rarely rising above 150 feet: the northern portion forms the seaward face of the western fells and the land rises north and north-east to over 900 feet on Bleng Fell and Hollow Moor. In common with all the western dales there are no sharp peaks, and the one valley which bisects the moorland is narrow and steep-sided, with a small development of flat land on the valley bottom through which runs the River Bleng.

Apart from a narrow belt of alluvium along both sides of the lower stretches of the Bleng, the 200-foot contour divides the parish roughly into a southern lowland of New Red Sandstone and a northern upland of andesite, with a small area of granite on the highest portion of Hollow Moor.

The intermediate position of the parish is also evident in its area, and in the size and distribution of its population. In Cumberland as a whole, small parishes with a relatively high density of population are typical of the lowlands and the North, while the moorlands are characterized by very large parishes with a few scattered farmsteads and cottages. Gosforth is much larger than the average coastal parish and much smaller than the fell parish. Moreover in many of the smaller parishes the population is concentrated almost entirely in nucleated settlements, while the inhabitants of the fell parishes live mainly in isolated farms. In Gosforth nearly two-thirds of the people live in the village, and
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the remainder in farmsteads and cottages dispersed throughout the parish.

In January 1951 Gosforth had 723 inhabitants,¹ most of whom were born in West Cumberland. Thus over two-thirds of the householders were born in the area within a ten mile radius of the parish, as were well over a half of their wives (see Appendix I, Table 1). The same proportions hold true for the parents of householders and their wives, and very probably a large number of the inhabitants of the parish are the modern representatives of families who have lived in this area for centuries. There are several people in Gosforth whose families have lived in the same place for four hundred years or more.

In addition a great many of the inhabitants were born in other parts of Cumberland, and a large number of these are only excluded from the proportions given above by the arbitrary nature of the chosen radius. Four out of every five of the male householders of Gosforth were born in the county, as were three out of every four of their wives, while only 28 per cent of their parents were born in other counties. Movement of families within West Cumberland has been common during the last hundred years, and therefore the proportion of householders (32·1 per cent) and their wives (23·5 per cent) and their parents (21·2 per cent and 16·1 per cent respectively) born within the parish is relatively small.

Like so many other counties in England, one of the marked characteristics of the modern history of Cumberland has been rural depopulation. In this area, however, the migration to the towns has taken place mainly within the county boundary, that is, from the rural parishes of the Lakeland foothills and plain to the industrial areas of the coast between Whitehaven and Maryport. For this reason there has been no decline in the population of the county as a whole (see Appendix I, Table 2(a)). The same is true of the Rural District of which Gosforth is a part, but when this unit is considered in detail, it is clear that the industrial parishes within it have grown in size at the expense of the rural parishes. Thus the population of Gosforth, in common with that in all the adjoining rural parishes, began to rise about 1810, after
remaining relatively stable for over two centuries, reached a maximum about 1870, and has declined steadily ever since, so that its present population is just over half what it was eighty years ago. This decline has affected the isolated farmsteads, for as we shall see later, the village has grown in size since 1870, and there are numerous farmhouses and cottages now used solely as barns and byres, and many others which have decayed completely until they are little more than a heap of rubble.

The history of Gosforth is in many ways a reflection of its remoteness and isolation. It was for centuries part of the barony of Coupland, an area renowned for its backwardness and difficulty of access. In 1563 it was described as 'that little angle where I was born, called Coupland, the ignorantest part in religion, and most oppressed of covetous landlords of any one part of this realm to my knowledge.' As late as the end of the eighteenth century, maps of this area showed the western Lakes hopelessly distorted and wrongly named, while Ennerdale Water and Wastwater, the two lakes nearest to Gosforth, remained free from the 'Romantic Invasion' until eighty years ago.

The inaccessibility of Coupland, which lasted until the latter half of the nineteenth century, meant that, in comparison with much of England, the area around Gosforth was largely unaffected by developments of a national character. Largely as a result of this, many cultural features of considerable antiquity have survived until the present day.

The first record of man in the Gosforth area dates back to prehistoric times. Neolithic stone axes were discovered in the parish in the decade following 1880, and are now kept in the village school as a symbol of the immense length of time which has elapsed since human activity began in this area. The Norse Cross and the hogback stones in the churchyard, and the numerous Norse place-names and personal names which occur in the district, recall the Viking invasions of the ninth and tenth centuries, and part of the Church, which has survived from the time following the death of William Rufus, testifies to the presence of the Normans who succeeded the Norsemen in the control of Coupland. This area, however, does not appear in the Domesday Book,
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since what is now Cumberland was not regarded as part of England until the beginning of the twelfth century. Then during the reign of Henry I this portion of North-West England became firmly established as part of the Anglo-Norman kingdom, a change that brought with it the founding of the great monasteries, one of which, at St. Bees, left a Chartulary that furnishes the first documentary evidence concerning Gosforth which is known to exist at the present time.

The centuries following the establishment of the St. Bees priory are only poorly documented until the beginning of the Parish Registers in 1571, and the Churchwardens' Accounts in 1697. These and other local sources are used extensively throughout this work and give an historical background to the sociological analysis.
In 1951, eighteen of the forty-one farms over fifty acres in Gosforth were freehold, twenty were farmed by tenants, and three were farmed by 'hinds' (i.e. estate managers) on behalf of owners living in the parish. Seven of the farms are part of an estate, the owner of which lives locally, four are part of an estate owned by an absentee landlord, and a further five belong to three estates which extend into Gosforth from adjoining parishes.

The history of land-holding in Gosforth is poorly documented and the limited evidence that exists is frequently conflicting. The earliest record is that of the Chartulary of St. Bees relating to the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and this reveals that Gosforth, in common with other areas where the manorial system prevailed, was split up into demesne lands and holdings farmed by tenants of the Lord of the Manor. Little, however, is known of the detailed distribution of these medieval holdings, and it is not until the late eighteenth century that the evidence sheds any light on the evolution of the present farms.

The earliest document which lists all the holdings in Gosforth is the Glebe Terrier of 1778. In this they are given together with their owners, and the amounts of modus in lieu of corn and hay which was payable in respect of each parcel of land. According to this document there were 137 holdings of land in the (then) parish, of which 15 are in the present parish of Seascale and 13 are unidentifiable, leaving a minimum of 109 holdings in what is now Gosforth. There was no large estate owned by one person. The Terrier names 99 owners, none of whom owned more than three farms. The Parish Award of 1815 shows that there had been little change in the intervening years. In this 111 holdings are listed, owned by 101 individuals. Again there is no indication of acreage, but from the maps which accompany the Award and from the evidence of scattered farm deeds, it is possible to describe
the system of land-holding at the beginning of the nineteenth century with some degree of certainty.

Before the Enclosure Act there were 2,708 acres of common land, out of a total of 8,565 acres in the old Parish. Nearly all this common lay within the smaller area which constitutes the present parish of Gosforth, accounting in fact for 38 per cent of its 7,124 acres (see Fig. 10). The remaining land was divided into 97 holdings, which included all the 41 present farmsteads and 9 of the present small-holdings. The remaining 47 holdings can all be identified and may be analysed as follows:

- Former farmsteads now incorporated into other farmsteads: 9
- Former 'wheel-barrow farms': 11
- Former small-holdings: 27

The distinctions employed here are based on scattered farm deeds, and the size of the buildings which remain. For example, farmsteads were holdings roughly equivalent in acreage to present-day farms. A 'wheel-barrow farm' was the local term for an enterprise that was just large enough to support a family engaged in full-time farming. There is fortunately enough evidence to distinguish between the size of the three types; the farmstead varied between 40 and 100 acres; the 'wheel-barrow farm' averaged about 15 acres, and representative small holdings ranged from 11/4 to 6 acres.

There were, therefore, 50 farms in Gosforth in 1800, most of which must have ranged in size from 50 to 100 acres. Interspersed among these were the wheel-barrow farms and small patches of land farmed by men who were also inn-keepers, farm labourers, and village craftsmen.

Grazing rights on the waste land, which had been very important from medieval times, were enjoyed by all farmers, and a great many of the farms were situated very near to stretches of common. There was a limited amount of squatting on the waste in the eighteenth century, and very probably there had been enclosure and improvement from time to time, a practice very prevalent in Cumberland. The Enclosure Act at the beginning of the nineteenth century divided all the common in the parish between the landowners, with about 200 acres for the Rector in
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lieu of small tithes and moduses. In all, 299 allotments were made, ranging in size from 8 perches to 141 acres. Although in most cases some attempt was made to apportion the common so that the allotments were as near to their owners' holdings as possible, there were several patches of waste situated some distance away from the holding to which they were allotted, and occasionally farmers were allotted three or four patches of common in widely separated parts of the parish. The years following 1815 were marked first by a general increase in the size of the holdings, and then, as the bigger farms bought the allotments of the smallholders, by an increase in the size of the larger holdings, and a decrease in the size of the small ones.

During the remainder of the nineteenth century the pattern of holdings remained more or less unchanged, but the years from 1850 onwards were marked by the growth of large estates owned by 'nouveau riche' people. These bought large numbers of holdings and substituted tenants for freeholders, without altering the amount of land attached to the farms to any great degree. Then after the first World War, economic factors of a national character forced estate owners to attempt to sell their property, and when this failed, they amalgamated several groups of farms, so that there was an increase in the number of large holdings (see Appendix II, Table 1). The wheel-barrow farm vanished in these post-war years, and the number of small-holdings decreased considerably. In the past ten years there has been a partial reversion to the conditions of a century and a half ago. The number of owner-occupiers rose from 13 to 18 between January 1945 and June 1951, and a further four farms were unsuccessfully offered for sale to their tenants in May 1951.

One of the most striking features of land-holding in Gosforth at present is the high degree of fragmentation (see Fig. 1). Much of this resulted from the division of the commons, many detached allotments being improved and linked permanently with certain holdings, but occasional farm deeds and the limited evidence afforded by the Parish Award suggests that it was a feature of the landscape before the beginning of the nineteenth century. Also typical are frequent changes of ownership, particularly of isolated
plots, though there are some holdings which have remained virtually unchanged in the possession of the same family for centuries. These however are all owner-occupied farms; on tenant farms on the other hand there has been considerable change in ownership, particularly during the last fifty years, so that there are now very few leasehold farms owned by the same landlords as twenty years ago.

Little can be said of the history of farming in Gosforth as distinct from that of the remainder of West Cumberland, which has been fully described by several authorities.\textsuperscript{11}

There is, however, a short eighteenth-century account of the
agriculture of the parish which is of interest for the local detail, and also for the background it provides to the description of the present conditions given in the remaining sections of this chapter.

'The produce is chiefly oats and a little barley: but the proprietors in general seem negligent, as the soil is certainly capable of being employed to a greater advantage by proper culture. Would the occupiers sow turnips \(^{12}\) (to which the ground seems peculiarly adapted), and dress them well, and the next year sow it with barley and clover or other artificial grass seeds, and so lay it down for a year or two, and then plow it out again for oats, and the next year work it in fallow for turnips, etc., they would certainly find a very great advantage; instead of which many of the farmers let several fields where the furze, with which the fences are in general, bearded and planted, had been suffered to spread their seed, and run all over the inclosure. There is an abundance of freestone but no limestone or coal. Upon the high commons to the east end of the parish, about 2,000 sheep are kept, which, with the other cattle \(^{13}\) are of the same quality with those of the neighbouring parishes. Here is only one road of any note which leads from Egremont to Ravenglass. No river, some small brooks. The parish is situated rather high, but is not mountainous, though uneven; it is destitute of wood; the roads are good and dry; the buildings in general are good.' \(^{14}\)

It has already been noted that Gosforth is intermediate in location, size and population. Its farming economy reflects this intermediate position, possessing features of both the highly specialized sheep-farming of the fells and of the arable and dairy farms of the immediate coastal lowlands, without, however, that sharp emphasis which characterizes these two extremes. In Gosforth there are no sheep farms composed entirely of vast expanses of rough grazing, while farms on which dairying and stock-raising respectively are the dominant occupation exist side by side.

The medial nature of the economy is seen to some extent in the size of farms and in the relative proportions of rough grazing and improved land. Of the 67 holdings the owners or tenants of which reside in the parish \(^{15}\) 5 are over 200 acres, only one over 300
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acres, while 28 are between 50 and 150 acres. Of the 28 holdings under 50 acres, only 4 are farmed as a full-time occupation. 19 out of the 41 farms in Gosforth are medium-sized, between 80 and 130 acres, but an analysis based on total farm acreage does not reveal the true pattern of land-holding. For example, the 3 farms which exceed 250 acres in area are composed respectively of 210 acres of crops and grass with 372 acres of rough grazing, 40 acres of crops and grass with 286 acres of rough grazing, and 250 acres of crops and grass with 27 acres of rough grazing. Again, of the 19 medium-sized farms, 13 have no rough grazing at all, 2 have less than a tenth in rough grazing and only one has more than half its area in unimproved land. This disparity in the relative proportions of cropland and rough grazing is, as we shall see later, closely related to differences in the actual economy of the individual farms.

Rough grazing occupies just over a quarter of the land held by Gosforth farmers, but its distribution is limited to a small number of holdings. Thus 8 farms account for over 82 per cent of the ‘park’ (the local term for rough grazing), the two biggest of these together occupying 39 per cent. Farm rents therefore vary not only according to total acreage, but also according to the proportion of the different types of land within the farm holdings. Further variations in rental result from differing accessibility of farms to main roads, the general state of farm buildings and the amount of repairs done by the respective landlords, altitude and degree of exposure, and the period of tenancy of the individual farmer. A few examples show how these factors interact:

(1) Farm A. A holding of 180 acres, of which 80 are rough grazing. The former tenant, who vacated in 1947, paid £95 a year; the new tenant pays £135 for the same acreage. The landlord was described by the occupier as ‘very good’ and all the repairs asked for have been carried out. The farm is situated near a main road, and milk for collection by the Milk Marketing Board has only to be taken about one hundred yards.

(2) Farm B. A holding of 84 acres, of which 6 are rough grazing.
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The last tenant, who vacated in 1948, paid £80 a year; the present tenant pays £120 for the same area. The farm buildings are in a good state of repair, but milk has to be taken over half a mile to the nearest main road.

(3) Farm C. A holding of 85 acres, none of which is rough grazing. The occupier, who has been a tenant since 1928, pays £57 a year, his rent having been raised by 20 per cent in 1950. It was said that no repairs have been made for a considerable time, despite frequent requests. The farm is about 350 yards from the main road.

The period of tenancy of the occupier and the policy of the landlord appear to be as important in determining the amount of farm rent as the basic factor of acreage and type of land. Most, if not all the landlords lowered rents by 10 per cent during the depression years of the early thirties and have raised them considerably in recent years whenever a change of tenancy allowed them to do so. The older tenants therefore pay much lower rents per acre than newcomers, but appreciable differences of rental occur even in the case of long-established tenants, since on one estate rents were generally raised by 20 per cent in 1950 by mutual agreement between landlord and tenant, while on the others this has not occurred.

For this reason no average rent can be considered as really representative. On farms consisting of crop- and grass-land only, with soils of similar quality, rents vary from 13s. 6d. to 35s. an acre. A holding equivalent in acreage to Farm A, and with a similar amount of rough grazing, has a rental of less than £70 a year. Only for the rough grazing can any average be fixed; holdings of rough grazing have a rental of 4s. 6d. to 6s. an acre throughout the parish.

Factors determining the selling price of land seem to be even more complex, and the limited information available together with the enormous range in the selling price of farms make generalization difficult. Six farms have been sold in the last five years, all by private treaty; the details are on the following page.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Rough Grazing</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Price Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rowan Side</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£2300</td>
<td>Mar. 1950</td>
<td>£19 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low Beck</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£4650</td>
<td>Sept. 1950</td>
<td>£27 14 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High Beck</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£1500</td>
<td>Feb. 1947</td>
<td>£37 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moor Gate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£1740</td>
<td>Feb. 1948</td>
<td>£39 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Black Bank</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£4700</td>
<td>Feb. 1950</td>
<td>£65 14 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bleng Hall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>£3375</td>
<td>May 1948</td>
<td>£67 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even after full allowance has been made for such factors as accessibility and condition of farm buildings (particularly operative in the case of Rowan Side, situated well away from main roads and with very poor outbuildings), the prices realized in these sales vary considerably. Low Beck was bought by the sitting tenant at what were described as 'very reasonable terms'. Moor Gate, High Beck and Rowan Side were bought by experienced farmers who had spent all their lives in the locality, though not in the parish itself. Black Bank was bought by a former businessman who had never farmed before, but who had always lived within fifteen miles of Gosforth. The second buyer of High Beck had no previous links with the parish and no knowledge of farming. Bleng Hall is now the property of a man with some farming experience, but no connection with Cumberland.

Despite these variations, all the buyers (in common with most of the other farmers in the district) have a well defined ideal pattern of farm purchase. The most desirable farm is a 'family holding', that is one that can be worked without the help of hired labour, and the payment of a high price for a comparatively small farmstead is justified by such rationalizations as 'It's cheaper than paying for a couple of hired men for the rest of your life anyway'. Low Beck, which is larger than the ideal 'family farm', is not considered to be exceptional because the occupier has three sons and a daughter and requires no hired labour to run the farm.

When describing their holdings, 11 farmers called them 'rearing farms', one 'stock-raising and arable', 27 said their farms were 'mixed' and 3 preferred the term 'dairy farms'. Classified by their main source of income, 30 are mixed farms deriving their greatest income from the sale of milk and potatoes, with stock-
raising as an important subsidiary, and 11 are stock-raising farms. Within this general framework four types of farm practice may be distinguished. These are:

(1) Mixed farms concentrating on milk production, with stock-rearing of minor importance.
(2) Mixed farms with milk production only slightly more important than stock-rearing.
(3) Rearing farms depending mainly on the sale of cattle.
(4) Rearing farms depending mainly on the sale of sheep.

(1) There are 10 farms of this type, each breeding either Friesians or Ayrshires for their milk-yielding qualities. On these farms heifer calves are kept and bull calves sold shortly after birth, as a rule to local markets for veal.

(2) These farms, 20 in number, breed mainly dual-purpose Shorthorns, or Shorthorn crosses, animals valued for their beef carcase as well as their milk. In this case heifer calves and bull calves are reared, the former for calving at two years and nine months, the latter for sale, usually as stores, at 12–18 months—though a few are kept and sold as fat bullocks after a period of up to three years, dependent on the amount and quality of grass available on the individual farm.

This division in mixed farming is comparatively recent. Until about 1930 there were no Friesians or Ayrshires in the parish, so that the breeding of animals for their milk yield alone was not practised. Although cross-breeding with Shorthorns has been very popular in West Cumberland generally, to produce a milk animal that also has a moderate beef carcase, this has not occurred on the 'milk' farms in Gosforth, all of which have pure-bred herds. Despite this fact they cannot be classified as dairy farms, since they lack many of the features normally associated with true dairy farming, e.g. they do not sell cows that are not in 'profit' and their proportion of cows in milk is lower than that typical of a dairying district. More recently still there has been a change in the mixed farmer's calving programme. Until a few years ago buying and breeding was arranged so that the animals calved from September to Christmas, in order to provide the greatest yield of
milk when it was at its maximum selling price. Nowadays the high price of feeding-stuffs more than counter-balances a low summer milk yield and calving is no longer confined to the latter months of the year. On all mixed farms calves are pail-fed.

(3) There are 7 farms in this category, none of which produce milk for sale. On these farms the main source of income is the sale of dairy heifers, for replacements in the lowland mixed farms. The sale of young store cattle is also important, while bull calves are often kept for two years before being sent to auction. These farms normally keep ten or twelve cows to breed a percentage of their own calves, or buy the remainder to make up their total young stock. Suckling is more important than pail-feeding, and a further difference between these and mixed farms is that calving takes place in the spring.

(4) On these 3 farms the breeding and sale of cattle follows the practice of those farms in category (3), but is subordinated to the breeding of sheep. These farmers depend mainly on the sale of shearlings and ewes in the fat market and only a few lambs that do not fatten are sold as stores to the lowlands. Draft ewes and wool are subsidiary sources of income.

Nearly all the cattle are bred locally; most farms have a bull for breeding, or use their neighbour’s. Only three farmers utilize the facilities offered by the Artificial Insemination Centre. On mixed farms sheep have a minor role. More than half these farms have no sheep of their own, though most of them provide winterage for 80–100 Herdwick ‘hoggss’ from the fell farms of Wasdale. The remainder have 20–60 Cheviot or Blackface ewes which are kept for fattening from autumn to spring and then sold, a new stock being bought annually as replacements. This is also typical of lowland cattle-rearing farms with little or no rough grazing, while those at higher levels breed their own flocks of 50–100 Cheviot or Herdwick sheep and sell fat lambs and ewes. On the hill farms the Herdwick is the only breed, the flocks ranging from three to five hundred in number. Farms with hill sheep differ somewhat from those with lowland breeds in their lambing programme, since Herdicks do not lamb until they are two years old.
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The part which sheep play in the economy has changed more drastically than that of cattle. Until recently many low-lying farms in the parish owned or rented expanses of rough grazing, each with its flock of 'heaf-gangin' sheep. The practice then was to draft store lambs from the outlying park to the fields around the farm for fattening. The farms at higher levels with limited areas of lowland grazing concentrated on the production of store lambs for disposal by auction. Lowland farms without rough grazing or fell rights carried far larger numbers of sheep for fattening than they do at present. To-day there is only one lowland farm which has a stock of fell sheep. The remainder have either relinquished their grazing to hill farmers, or to the Forestry Commission which has covered extensive areas of fell with trees.

Pigs are important as a source of money income on four farms only, and most farms have only one pig for domestic use. Poultry is an important sideline on many farms (200–300 hens are quite common) and there are also two herds of Shetland and fell ponies, reared mainly for sale to collieries in Co. Durham (at Wigton in October).

In 1949, over two-fifths of the cultivated land was under permanent grass, a little less than a third in temporary grass and clover, and oats and rootcrops occupied a fifth and a twelfth respectively. All crops are consumed on the farm, with the exception of potatoes which are sold in some quantity, and in most years considerable amounts of feeding-stuffs are bought in addition, particularly on mixed farms. In one case the cost of feeding-stuffs exceeded five times the rent paid by the tenant, and there were many instances in which it amounted to three times the rent or more. One result of the bad harvest of 1950 has been the introduction of silage on several farms. Crop acreages for four holdings representative of the different types of farming are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of farm*</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Oats</th>
<th>Potatoes</th>
<th>Roots</th>
<th>Hay</th>
<th>Rough Grazing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (1)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4'5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (2)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4'5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearing (3)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearing (4)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5'5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The numbers refer to the classification given earlier.