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Malcolm Chase

Asa Briggs’ move to Leeds from Oxford in 1955 surprised many. The University was reputable and solid but distinctly lacking in glamour. It was no coincidence that its first professor of organic chemistry developed an extensive research programme into smoke and soot pollution.¹ Not without some acerbity, Eric Hobsbawm related how in 1959 he forsook London for Leeds and a meeting with Asa. He was wearing a yellow sheepskin coat, recently acquired, for the occasion. ‘When I left’, Hobsbawm recalled, ‘the black flakes of soot in the West Riding city atmosphere had settled on the white wool of my sheepskin. It was never the same again’.²

The man from Keighley (who would also go on to write an illuminating essay, ‘Carboniferous Capitalism’³) was less-easily repelled by the soot. But the department he joined, though dating from the 1870s and somewhat inclined to stand on its dignity, had only 10 staff crowded into one unprepossessing Victorian house. Of its previous five professorial heads, only Arthur Turberville (in post 1929-1945) registers on Michael Bentley’s historiographical radar.⁴ The University’s first official historian tartly claimed that Turberville, ‘retracted visibly from any attempt to popularise academic studies’.⁵ However, the departmental headship since 1945 of the distinguished medievalist John Le Patourel was of a different stamp and under his leadership the Leeds School of History was changing.⁶ Asa Briggs was recruited as the modern history chair on the basis that he would have a free hand in reforming the Leeds curriculum.⁷

Asa’s move to Leeds was more than merely surprising. Sir Brian Harrison remembers that it ‘was regarded ... as a very significant moment’ by the historical profession. An Oxbridge-LSE triangle had hitherto dominated social history through the work of R. H. Tawney and G. D. H. Cole at Oxford, Lance Beales at the LSE, and Kitson Clark at Cambridge. Harrison argues that ‘the regional dimension ... particularly important in the growth of social history’ was substantially consolidated by Leeds’ success in luring Asa Briggs back to his native Yorkshire.⁸ Once there, his prodigious energies found outlets both within and beyond the University, and their range offers an insight into his conception of the cultural and social role of the historian in wider society.

It was through extra-mural activities that Asa’s first initiatives in curriculum development began. He bridled at the ‘departmentalism’ that in his view beset the University, ‘I had to sign treaties with the heads of [other] departments; there was no notion of co-operation
between them’. However Sydney Raybould, head of the Department of Adult Education and Extra-Mural Studies, was the exception to this pattern.\textsuperscript{9} Between 1958 and 1960 alone, for example, Briggs devised and led a class on ‘The development of Russia and the United States in Modern Times’. This was the first time that post-war history had been taught anywhere on a Leeds University syllabus. He also contributed to a further course, ‘The Victorian Age’, as a member of a stellar panel that also included J. F. C. Harrison, Donald Read, Roy Shaw and E. P. Thompson. In addition he lectured on residential courses National Health Service administrators, and for the University’s Services Education Committee, on industrial history and technical development at an Industrial Engineering residential course at Catterick Camp. Briggs was also an early supporter of the University’s newly opened Adult Education Centre in Middlesbrough, where he reprised his inaugural lecture, ‘History and its neighbours’.\textsuperscript{10}

All this was in addition to many other public commitments, for example speaking to the Thoresby Society (the local historical society) on Leeds’ Town Hall, and the Bronte Society on ‘Private and Social Themes in Shirley’; and leading a School of History public lecture series on the history of Leeds. Beyond Yorkshire, Asa Briggs became the national president of the Workers’ Education Association and a member of the University Grants Committee, both in 1957.\textsuperscript{11} Alongside broadcasting, he also reviewed for the \textit{Economist, Manchester Guardian, Listener, New Statesman, Observer, Reynolds News} and \textit{Yorkshire Post}.

Complementing these outward-facing activities were two others that, initially intra-mural, soon overflowed the boundaries of the University. In November 1956, Asa circulated staff from Adult Education, Agriculture, Economics and Geography as well as his own department: ‘we are proposing to organise a small Northern History Group to study from this university problems of North of England History’.\textsuperscript{12} Membership was extended to local history activists, archivists and librarians. After his departure for Sussex, the Group (led by Gordon Forster, the first appointment to the School during the Briggs years) was the basis from which Leeds launched the first-ever regional history journal \textit{Northern History} in 1966. Asa himself contributed an agenda-setting first article.\textsuperscript{13}

A second outward-facing activity, modelled on the Northern History Group, bore more-immediate fruit though it soon floated free from Leeds. This was a Labour History Group, for which JFC Harrison (then in the Leeds extra-mural department) took on the organisational responsibilities as Forster would do for northern history.\textsuperscript{14} Leeds thus acted ‘as the instigator and midwife’ of the
[British] Society for the Study of Labour History, formed in January 1960, with Asa as chairman and John Harrison secretary. This pairing was adroit in both drawing together, and then retaining the support of, a somewhat uncomradely cadre of historical specialists, ‘a consortium of people’ Asa recollects, ‘whom I knew did not agree with each other about labour history or current socialist politics. [John] Saville was not on the best terms with Henry Pelling or Edward Thompson who were certainly not on the best terms with each other ... Eric Hobsbawm was very much on his own’.

In his inaugural address to the Society for the Study of Labour History, Asa Briggs made the percipient observation that ‘Labour History as a whole has suffered from the neglect of its international dimension. There is a real need to break with insularity and to develop comparisons’. This was a call largely unanswered within labour history until the 1990s. However, if any one thing distinguished the Briggs years at Leeds, it was a determination to break down insularity and develop comparison in every corner of the historical curriculum. This was apparent even in his 1958 adult education class, with lectures such as ‘American and Russian History: contrasts and comparisons’. It was yet more evident in the way Briggs powerfully and permanently shaped the undergraduate history syllabus.

When Asa Briggs arrived in 1955 the University of Leeds was still smarting from the departure of Norman Gash for St Andrews. Though brief, Gash’s tenure of its chair of Modern History had been marked by extensive syllabus reform and to a considerable extent the School of History was suffering from innovation fatigue. The advert for the vacant chair was noticeably reticent about any scope for innovation, merely making stock remarks about teaching undergraduates, supervising postgraduates and undertaking research. John Le Patourel later explained to the Vice Chancellor, Sir Charles Morris, that:

> When Briggs came in 1955 I asked him not to make any changes at once. We had made fairly far-reaching changes in the curriculum to suit Gash and I felt whether our compromise was good or bad it must at least run through a ‘generation’ of students. Briggs was very good about this.

However it is clear that Asa Briggs was convinced that a thorough-going reform was long overdue. His inaugural lecture, *History and Its Neighbours*, was influenced by current developments in the history of ideas, a discipline not much evident in British universities at this time but whose self-identity was being widely debated among its American exponents. Briggs made it plain that ‘I want
historians to devote more time not only to people in society (with proper concern for people) but to the study of societies both in themselves and comparatively’. And after just one term in post, he made a case for new posts as ‘a matter of urgency’, telling the Registrar:

None of the lecturers or assistant lecturers on the modern side are qualified to lecture or teach European history after 1848. Hitherto, most of the work in the History Department has stopped at about 1850... We are lamentably weak on this side.

Asa found the University lukewarm to this argument. The School of History was permitted to make one temporary assistant lecturer appointment only and he had to deliver many of the twentieth-century European lectures himself. The following year, he sent-in another case for new staff, but – learning fast – Asa now placed greatest emphasis upon the workload implications of growing undergraduate numbers, and their interest in modern history. His argument about student numbers was not contrived: there had been fifty-three single-honours undergraduates in the 1953-4 academic year but by 1957-8 there were ninety (the year in which admissions to the first year exceeded forty for the first time).

Asa Briggs’ intention, however, was not just to extend the chronological reach of the Leeds history curriculum into twentieth century Europe. He was also ‘emphasised the importance of introducing some non-European history if the department is to be alive to changes in the modern world and to fulfil its proper responsibilities’. The case for a new appointment to facilitate this fell on deaf ears. So in 1958, as part of the broader revision of the history syllabus that he was only now encouraged to suggest, Asa proposed ‘to introduce optional courses in Asian History, 1815-1947 for second and third-year students as soon as possible and to lecture [on them] myself’. This was no light undertaking, and he was candid that his own reading was ‘only a chapter or two ahead of his class’. Such was his proselytising zeal for this project that he was universally re-named ‘Asia Briggs’ by his colleagues. The Asia history course was one of three new options from which students chose in their final year, the others being American History, 1783-1950 (Asa led from the front in teaching much of that too) and Russian History, 1860-1945. The popularity of the latter innovation made the School a powerful advocate in persuading the University to appoint the first historian to the department of Russian Studies a few years later.
Nor did the Briggs reforms stop there. Alongside contemporary and non-European history, his new syllabus sought ‘to devote special interest during the students’ three-year course to what might be described as a “sub-history”’. Alongside a long-established and conventional course, the History of Political Thought, the revised syllabus offered alternatives in the ‘history of ... social thought, or economic thought or scientific thought’.27 The latter was one of the focal points from which a formally constituted History and Philosophy of Science section later emerged in the School of Philosophy. The two other ‘sub-histories’ faired less well. History of Economic Thought, for which Asa had to provide all the teaching, had just one taker in its first year: she recalled ‘that their tutorials were frequently interrupted by international telephone calls’. History of Social Thought was more warmly received and was also the springboard for two publications, a path-breaking essay on ‘The Welfare State in Historical Perspective’ and a book on Seebohm Rowntree. Both of these appeared, alongside the first volume of The History of Broadcasting, in 1961, a resounding climax to the publications of Asa Briggs’ Leeds years, which also included The Age of Improvement and the seminal edited collection Chartist Studies, both published in 1959.28

His steadily expanding academic profile meant that Briggs also bore the brunt of developing postgraduate research in modern history, albeit with mixed results. One conspicuous success was Wolfgang Mommsen, who would become one of the most widely known German historians of the later twentieth century. Mommsen came to regard his debt to Briggs and to Leeds generally as significant: he spent the 1958-59 academic year at the University of Leeds on a British Council postgraduate scholarship, an experience he described as both ‘very fortunate’ and preferable to his initial choice of the London School of Economics.29 By 1960 Asa was supervising fourteen postgraduates; some were inherited from the early 1950s and their engagement with supervised research was hugely variable. Dorothy Thompson, for example, had registered to study ‘The last phase of Chartism with special reference to Ernest Jones’ as long ago as 1950. In view of her family, part-time extra-mural teaching and political commitments, it is unlikely she troubled Briggs overmuch.

In any case, a certain frostiness, pervaded Briggs’s relations with the Thompsons. He declined to include in Chartist Studies the chapter on Halifax Chartism that he had commissioned from Edward Thompson, the greater part of which seems to have written by Dorothy.30 And alone among the extra-mural department’s full-time history lecturers, Edward Thompson was never offered an opportunity to teach in the School of History, in spite of Raybould’s
advocacy. The nearest he came to doing so was in 1960 when arrangements were being made to cover Asa’s teaching ahead of the latter’s visit to Australia; but Briggs stalled, explaining that ‘he would like to be on hand’ when Thompson began teaching.\[31\]

Relations with E. P. Thompson appear to have produced a rare discordant note in Asa’s otherwise harmonious dealings with his extra-mural counterparts, as well as within the emerging field of labour history. It is worth emphasizing in this context how much of Asa Brigg’s energies during his Leeds years were directed at defining and nurturing the emerging field of labour history, an enterprise which involved him in considerable editorial work. ‘He was a great inspiration to us’, John Harrison recalls: ‘the history of working people was not respectable academically: that is why Asa was so important – he was respectable’.\[32\] There was a significant Communist and ex-Communist presence among labour historians, but John McIlroy has concluded that Briggs had no aversion to left-wing commitment in historical scholarship, ‘so long as it provoked rather than arrested critical enquiry and work of quality’.\[33\] Of Thompson’s magisterial *Making of the English Working Class*, Briggs commented privately that it was not a book ‘for those who like their history to be scrupulously fair and balanced.’ Even that comment, though, was made in the context of a warm recommendation that Leeds should confer a readership on Thompson, in which he observed of the *Making*, ‘there is a strong argument for thinking this is the best piece of social history since the Hammonds’.\[34\]

A further reform at Leeds for which Asa was responsible was pedagogic, albeit one that originated as a pragmatic response to the challenge of intensive teaching in curriculum areas he did not feel he had mastered. He candidly told the president of the Students’ Union that these new ‘working seminars’ made it ‘possible to get the benefits of direct student participation and the division of labour at the same time’. The entire course on the history of Asia was conducted in this style.\[35\] Some smaller innovations are also telling: Briggs and Le Patourel astonished the University with a proposal they should jointly head the School of History when Le Patourel’s initial term as its head expired in 1957.\[36\] Cutting edge technology in the form of a photocopier was introduced into the School office. Asa totally rejected addressing colleagues by their surname alone (Dear Harrison, Dear Forster, etc.). He also quickly abandoned wearing an academic gown for lectures, then considered *de rigueur* at Leeds. Certain other sartorial choices were also ahead of their time. The lime-green casual shirt worn for his 1959 Middlesbrough adult education lecture made an impression almost as powerful as the lecture on the social historian Bob Morris, a teenage member of the audience at the time.\[37\]
Asa’s colleagues seem to have taken dress reform in their stride; but some were uncomfortable with the syllabus developments. A few, even, were unforgiving of the energy which he brought to outward-facing activities. As far as the curriculum reforms were concerned, the problem was compounded by the void left behind when Briggs spent six months during 1960 at the Centre for the Advanced Study of the Humanities at Australia National University, Canberra. This provided an unnerving foretaste of the situation from the autumn of the following year when he left permanently for Sussex. ‘The changes he has made here have scarcely established themselves’, John Le Patourel told the Vice-Chancellor, adding somewhat plaintively that ‘It [is] exceedingly difficult for anyone who is not Briggs to know how to carry on from the point at which he is leaving us’. The School had to lean heavily on staff from other departments to supply the gap Briggs had left behind.38

In considering its strategy for a replacement appointment, the University also pondered the distractions of media appearances and broadsheet newspaper book reviewing, both of which it thought were likely to be strewn in the path of Briggs’ successor if they too were – as the School termed it – ‘a modern modernist’. ‘No doubt the University gains a very great deal from having a national figure among its professoriate’, Le Patourel observed, but he added tellingly ‘in the department, a price has to be paid for this – a price that one might be very willing to pay for Briggs but not necessarily for anyone else’.39 Beyond the History department were others who were conspicuously less-charitable. Asa had complained openly, even to comparative juniors amongst his colleagues, about the obstructiveness of those he described as ‘old guard’ professors.40 However, the most stringent critic was not from this old guard but the recently elected Professor of Economic History (in the Department of Economics) Maurice Beresford. Exact contemporaries at Cambridge, the two men shared an intellectual debt to the innovative medievalist John Saltmarsh, with whom they went field walking as undergraduates. While at Leeds, however, Briggs on his own admission was puzzled by Beresford’s insularity and reluctance to associate with the School of History. In a confidential letter to the Vice-Chancellor concerning the succession, Beresford described Briggs’ appointment as ‘a disaster for our School of History’, with little time for, or interest in, the University. Beresford was dismissive of the myriad of external activities in which his erstwhile ‘fellow trooper across the fields’ had engaged:

The Leeds History School now needs an Insider. The School can sacrifice itself once every generation to the service of the outside world, but I hope it will not be asked to do so
twice... The world and the public must contain their appetite for the services of our Professor of Modern History for a while; they have not been stinted.\textsuperscript{41}

Beresford was careful to stress that he had discussed no part of this letter with Le Patourel. In part his comments resonate with Briggs’ unvarnished irritation with much University bureaucracy. ‘While at Leeds’, he has written, ‘I became thoroughly dissatisfied with “departmentalism” ... often as much concerned with \textit{amour propre} as with academic issues’.\textsuperscript{42}

Le Patourel mused that it might be expedient to replace Asa with a seventeenth-century specialist. External distractions would be fewer, besides which he thought, ‘we know where we are with a book on the seventeenth century: [but] the criteria of work on history that is almost contemporary have not yet been established’. The University was sufficiently persuaded by this argument to approach Christopher Hill with an invitation to consider its Chair of Modern History.\textsuperscript{43} That appointment, had it been made, would doubtless have proved as bracing in its way as that of Briggs had been. Hill, however, declined even to visit Leeds. Eventually Arthur J. Taylor, a moderately ‘modern modernist’ historian of Britain succeeded Asa.\textsuperscript{44}

However, Asa Briggs had let the genie of modern history out of the bottle. Few really thought it either possible or desirable to try and force it back. Although Taylor and Le Patourel confessed that they were unconvinced that ‘an immediate appointment is desirable in the field of Asian history’, they did argue the ‘pressing need on the modern side’ for a Europeanist.\textsuperscript{45} The result was the appointment, cautious only in its periodicity, of Richard Cobb (and then when the latter left in 1963 of Ernst Wangermann). On receiving assurances that the School could proceed with this modern European appointment, Taylor then expedited a new post in Chinese history in January 1962. The appointment (of Jerome Ch’en, on the cusp of a distinguished career) was made in conjunction with the University’s new Centre for Far-Eastern Studies. This had been established following a recent University Grants Committee initiative (the ‘Hayter Report’) to develop East European, Oriental and African Studies. However, the post to which Ch’en was appointed was ‘over and above the earmarked’ grant for this purpose. So this was a genuine and substantial commitment by a History department that clearly had been persuaded of the imperative to extend the geographical and chronological reach of the curriculum it offered.\textsuperscript{46}

No less significantly, the hiatus that Asa Briggs’ departure created was used to make forceful cases for an appointment in the ‘history
of international relations or British foreign policy’ from 1870 to the present day, and for a second chair in modern history. John Le Patourel first floated this proposal in his initial thinking on how best to replace Asa (declaring a self-denying ordinance against expanding medieval history in so doing). In 1965 this vision was realised with the appointment of J. A. S. Grenville, unequivocally ‘a modern modernist’, to a newly established second chair. The development of International History and Politics, which was to become (as it remains) one of the defining features of the discipline of History at the University of Leeds, stemmed directly from this aspect of Asa Briggs internationalisation and modernisation of the curriculum. Yet one senses that the Briggs’ legacy continued to be viewed ambiguously at Leeds and that he never received full credit for the work he did there. He is, for example, conspicuous by his absence from an otherwise detailed survey of the history of the department, written by his successor as Chair of Modern History.

While his commitments beyond Leeds were the stuff almost of legend, Asa had made his family home in the city and entered fully into the social and cultural life of the University and its environs. Furthermore his frequent absences were balanced by an unmatched capacity for work as well as a clear vision for innovation.

His six years in Leeds, Asa Briggs has written, were ‘a very creative period of my life’. During his visit to Canberra in 1960, Briggs chose ‘The Map of Learning’ as the title for a lecture at Australia National University. He was already looking ahead to the move he would make to the Pro Vice-Chancellorship at Sussex University after his return to Britain. But it was at Leeds during the 1950s that Briggs embarked on the re-drawing of the map of learning with which his subsequent career was to become so closely associated.
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