

Editors' Introduction: Telling Academic Lives

Geoffrey Gray
Doug Munro
Christine Winter

The historian, before he begins to write history, is the product of history.... It is not merely the events that are in flux. The historian himself is in flux.... Before you study the history, study the historian. (E.H. Carr, 1961)¹

TELLING *ACADEMIC LIVES* IS A COLLECTION of historical biographies that examine historians and anthropologists, their lives, careers, institutional affiliations, challenges and achievements. In short, it deals with academics as real people. The six historians whose biographical analyses form this special edition are part of a wider *Zeitgeist*, namely embodied histories and a return to the humane. It is as if the new century starts—yet again—a turn towards the individual, the specific, the unique and the irreplaceable, as features of humanness. The historian and biographer Barbara Caine writes: “Biography has long been seen as part of history and a way to enliven it by rendering the past ‘more human’, more vivid, more intimate, more accessible, more connected to ourselves.”²

History as an analysis of the past has had many high hopes invested in it: for telling us where we are coming from and thus where

Geoffrey Gray, Doug Munro, Christine Winter, “Editors’ Introduction: Telling Academic Lives,” *Journal of Historical Biography* 16 (Autumn 2014): 1-32, www.ufv.ca/jhb. © Journal of Historical Biography 2014. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION 2

we are heading, and for making marginal, forgotten voices audible. Historical biography in particular seems to resonate with a quest to counter barbarism and inhumanity. The challenge, according to philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas, is to confront a new barbarism, characterized by “radical exteriority...and the foreignness of the other man.” Against this he calls for culture, as care and protection of another—“culture as a breach made by the humane in the barbarism of being.”³

This collection deals with a paradox. We contend that, because the historians analysed here are at times flawed, selfish or narrow-minded individuals, they are ideally suited to make a case for the humane: flawless and lifeless they are not, but human they are. The writers of the articles, historians themselves, thus pay respect to their colleagues of the past as real people, makers of history and historical figures. There is, as Caine states, a “growing insistence on the need to understand the social and political contexts in which individuals lived but also to explore in much more detail the complex ways in which individuals relate to the world.”⁴ *Telling Academic Lives* is by academics about academics; it includes varying degrees of autobiography by the very nature of the task. The autobiographical elements are sometimes implicit; at other times they are the dominant theme.

The problems of writing biography and autobiography raised in “Telling Academic Lives” are as varied as the subjects and contributors. María Jesús González discusses some of the problems she experienced in researching her biography of Raymond Carr (b.1919), her second biography,⁵ especially in interacting with a living subject and in familiarizing herself with a cultural milieu outside her previous experience. William Palmer discusses his adventures and misadventures in writing a group biography of historians and a follow-up book on the history of some of the more prominent history departments in American universities.⁶ Christine Winter recounts an ongoing engagement with the work of her dissertation supervisor in the process of maturing from graduate student to colleague.⁷ Ronald Hughes, Geoffrey Gray, and Doug Munro offer contributions in more conventional biographical modes. Hughes discusses Howard Zinn’s

(1922-2010) work as an activist.⁸ Gray analyses the making of the career of Australian anthropologist Ronald M. Berndt (1916-1990), and Berndt's careful manufacture of his early life, which became the "truth" accepted by colleagues and friends alike.⁹ Doug Munro and Bill Murray discuss the career of George Rudé (1915-93), the Marxist social historian of eighteenth-century France and England, whose quest for academic employment was initially blighted by Cold War anxieties. Murray provides a short memoir on his relationship with Rudé,¹⁰ while Munro's article is an in-depth biographical essay.



Academic lives can be presented in a variety of ways. The contributors to this special issue concentrate on more conventional modes of auto/biographical writing and presentation; there are many ways in which life stories are narrated and presented. They are occasionally told in plays and films, such as the television series *A Very Peculiar Practice* (1986, 1988) and the adaptation of Holocaust historian Saul Friedländer's autobiography into a film.¹¹ More often, academic lives are told via the medium of the campus novel. The extent to which these are accurate representations is often unknown, or at least ambiguous. The dialogue at committee meetings in Don Aitkin's *The Second Chair* rings resoundingly true and is probably inspired by some of his own experiences with fractious colleagues.¹² On the other hand, the extent of satire in Larry Wittner's hilarious *What's Going On At UAardvark?* stretches credibility, although the plot was based on his experience at Vassar College where a proposed IBM Corporation-sponsored technology centre was prevented on the grounds of the company's lucrative contracts with the US Defense Department.¹³ In a recent issue of the *Times Higher Education* a short article asked: "University life: which works of fiction are most telling?" It remarked that "It has long been the practice of disgruntled academics with a literary bent to vent their frustrations by writing a

campus novel.”¹⁴ In her biography of Raymond Carr, González draws attention to the tension between fact and fiction in Nicholas Mosley’s campus novel *The Accident* (1965), whose main characters are based on Mosley himself and on Carr. Among other things, *The Accident* was intended as “a bitter commentary on the hypocrisy of the British upper classes and intellectual elites and amounts to an exercise in contortion and self-criticism.”¹⁵

Whatever the factual or fictional content of individual campus novels, truth of a different sort emerges when the genre is seen in the round. An overview of the campus novel can be used to identify issues of the academy and to chart the changes in universities.¹⁶ This genre should be taken seriously, not only as an outlet of frustrations, but of intense concern about academic life and present changes; its satirical critique has purpose. The more conventional mode of analysis and narration in *Telling Academic Lives* should not deceive the reader. In the examination of past practices of history and academic structures, an element of critique about the present is inherent.

Academic lives are commonly told via the biographical mode, usually by other academics. The journal article and book chapter are the most common form, and these range from fond remembrances of a mentor to rigorous assessments of aspects of their work and legacy, or else focus on critical moments in their lives.¹⁷ Monograph-length biographies of academics are increasingly common. They are also becoming longer and more thoroughly researched. Although seldom reaching the gigantism of many biographies of US presidents, some academic biographies exceed seven hundred pages of text and apparatus.¹⁸

In present struggles over historical representations, historians themselves are increasingly the subjects of public interest and debate. Australia’s “history wars” over the teaching of history, especially in regard to the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, provide an example of the controversies that have cut to the core of national identity.¹⁹ Public debates in the United States over historical treatments of slavery, in Germany and central Europe over the Holocaust, and in Japan over its role in World War II and exploitation of “comfort

women” are others. The high profile of such historiographical controversies has correspondingly raised the profile of those historians involved.

In keeping with current biographical trends, biographies of academics have become more open and candid about their subject’s private and even sexual lives. In addition, the late twentieth century witnessed a move to cut across class boundaries, and those of gender, ethnicity and sexual identity, which led to the questioning of the grand narrative. Examples are *American Women Historians, 1700s-1990s: A Biographical Dictionary*, which contains over two hundred entries on practising women historians in the United States; and *Telling Histories: Black Women Historians in the Ivory Tower*, which explores how the personal and political intersect in the writing of history and auto/biography.²⁰

Edited collections, usually organized around a theme, are also becoming increasingly common.²¹ For example, mid-career and senior historians have been asked about what attracted them to history and their practice.²² Gray engaged in a similar exercise when he invited several senior anthropologists—all born c.1930—to reflect on their decisions to choose anthropology and how their early careers developed.²³ Similarly, a group biography of Australasian social scientists, including historians and anthropologists—*Scholars at War*—examined the expansion of career and intellectual opportunities both at home and abroad that directly resulted from wartime demands.²⁴

In contrast are the conferences dedicated to a particular historian—such as those to commemorate Hugh Trevor-Roper (1914-2003),²⁵ Eric Hobsbawm (1917-2012),²⁶ and E.P. Thompson (1924-93),²⁷ as well as earlier such gatherings on W.K. Hancock (1898-1988)²⁸ and Bernard Smith (1916-2011).²⁹ Resulting *Festschriften* are often explicitly celebratory and increasingly contain considerable biographical information in addition to formal essays.³⁰ There are also conferences and workshops to discuss historians’ auto/biographies as a genre.³¹

The significance and scholarly merit of historians’ autobiographies have been increasingly recognized since the appearance of

Jeremy Popkin's seminal *History, Historians, & Autobiography* (2005).³² Book-length autobiographies by historians have grown in number from the early-1980s, to the extent that they can be categorized. Popkin argues that there are four groups of historians likely to write autobiographies: elites, immigrant scholars, radical historians, and those who identify themselves in terms of race, ethnicity and gender.³³ Amongst the radical group is Howard Zinn, author of the autobiography *You Can't be Neutral on a Moving Train* (1994). The book sets out his credo that "all history is partial." A different take on autobiography as introspection, more in the strand of elite histories, was chosen by long-time professor of history at the University of Melbourne, R.M. Crawford. In his contribution to *Making History*, he wrote that, after he was asked "to write something about the ideas I brought to the shaping of the Melbourne history school in my time," he embarked on "a journey of self-examination which must result not in an autobiography, but in what Croce called his account of himself: *Contributto alla Critica di me Stesso*, a contribution to the criticism of myself."³⁴

In addition, there is a style of autobiographical writing called *ego-histoire*, which is gaining acceptance in the English-speaking world.³⁵ Again, an impetus has been the work of Jeremy Popkin, who explicitly engages with this French art form.³⁶ The terms "historians' autobiographies" and "*ego-histoire*" are often used interchangeably, but a precise meaning attaches to the latter. Autobiography in this new sub-genre has a purpose beyond introspection. It contrasts impersonal objectivity with existential involvement of the historian as theme and tool of *ego-histoire*. The history that one makes and the history that makes us are intrinsically linked. In this collection there is no explicit *ego-histoire*, though the linking of history making in its double sense has an impact on the way historians analyse historians here. Christine Winter, for example, uses herself as the vehicle to explore themes of gender and hierarchy in the making of a historian and history.

Historical journals are increasingly making provision for interviews and other autobiographical expressions. Indicative of the

trend is the *Canadian Historical Review*, which has featured one or more autobiographical articles per issue since 2011. There is a degree of conformity in that they tend to discuss a historian's life only insofar as it relates to the work and to omit details about personal life and immediate family.³⁷ The "work" extends to political activism and engagement in civic affairs.³⁸ Only occasionally are experimental autobiographical pieces that push the boundaries attempted in mainstream historical journals.³⁹ The same observations apply to edited collections of autobiographies, although in recent years the tendency has been towards increasing personal disclosure, or, in Caine's analysis, a turn to the "human" and "intimate."⁴⁰

Intimacy and subjectivity in varying degrees are at the heart of the interview situation; an interview is, in essence, another type of autobiography. The content is screened through the medium of an interviewer and directed by his or her questions and interests. This need not be a constraining feature, although sometimes it is. Such a device has a potential advantage, insofar as aspects of the subject's life which the interviewee may not have thought to raise get aired. Many academic journals make provision for interviews, and the subjects of interviews are typically senior academics.⁴¹ At another level, libraries and institutions make provision for taped interviews, and more recently for videotaped interviews.⁴² This latter has obvious advantages, allowing the viewer an extra layer of interpretation by way of the subject's body language and facial expressions—just as audio has the advantage over a transcription in revealing tone of voice and telling pauses in the respondent's replies. The camera, however, can be off-putting and result in people not being their usual selves: about half of the twenty-eight historians interviewed in a series organized by the Institute of Historical Research in London appeared ill at ease in their unfamiliar situation.⁴³

An aspect of interviews often overlooked is the extent to which many have been finessed for publication. Sometimes, they are not "interviews" at all but written responses to questions. In the early- to mid-2000s, Doug Munro was the regular interviewer for the (sadly-defunct) New Zealand journal *History Now*. He was no purist.

Of the eleven interviews he conducted during this time, only two were recorded on tape. The remainder were cut-and-pastes of e-mail exchanges with people living in different cities. In one instance, Munro's predecessor was given a written statement and told to organize questions around it, which further emphasizes that what purport to be an "interviews" are often not that at all, but a different type of engagement. Another permutation is Daniel Snowman's twenty-eight interviews of historians, conducted between 1998 and 2005 on behalf of *History Today*, which formed the basis of Snowman's 2006 work, *Historians*.⁴⁴ The individual essays were based on taped interviews *and* a reading of the given historian's work. The results are, in many respects, more coherent for the reader than the transcription of a recorded interview, but the historians concerned had diminished control over content. Much the same applies to Richard J. Evans' *Cosmopolitan Islanders* (2009) which draws on the responses of colleagues involved in writing the history of continental Europe as well as recounting his own experiences.⁴⁵ Evans quotes extensively from his respondents' letters but he chooses what goes in, he decides what gets left out, and he determines in what contexts the inclusions are presented. It is he who arranges and analyses the material, not the respondents.



In this collection, five of the contributions are by historians who personally knew the subject or subjects of their biographical endeavour. Murray uses intimate personal recollections; Winter recalls conversations from memory; Palmer's group biography in turn is also based on extensive interviews he conducted, though he himself was not a member of the history departments he writes about; Munro combines memory with interviews and archival research. Palmer recalls one reaction to a draft of his account of the Princeton history department:

[O]ne very senior person responded with what was at once a lengthy, thoughtful, and rigorous critique. Several of his criticisms were quite penetrating and went to the heart of the issues that surround trying to write the history of history departments. He pointed out, correctly, that, with the exception of Lawrence Stone and Gordon Craig, I was writing about a department where I did not know anyone. The result, from his point of view, was somewhat disconcerting, almost like being in a twilight zone. He had the odd sensation that he was being written about by someone who not only did not know him but who also did not know anyone else connected with his life.

This critique is a negation of the historical enterprise. Palmer's respondent is saying, in effect, that Lawrence Stone's background as an English public school-boy, Oxbridge undergraduate, army officer, and career academic at Oxford and Princeton renders him, *ipso facto*, unable to understand "the vision of life" of seventeenth-century English peasants because he never lived in Stuart England and is far removed in social background from the peasantry.⁴⁶ But it does not work that way in practice—personal acquaintance is the exception rather than the norm in the study of history. Historians, moreover, routinely deal with the unfamiliar—that is to say, most historians write about periods that concluded before they were born and, by definition, about people they never met. The respondent's notions are bizarre; he himself writes about others he never knew and of periods before his own lifetime, and yet cannot countenance the thought of a stranger writing about matters of concern to himself. As Palmer has said elsewhere, "An understanding of intellectual history sometimes requires the study of bad ideas."⁴⁷

There is the suggestion from Palmer's respondent that he knows better because he was there. It recalls high school days for some of us when we were introduced to the various Blackwell's *We Saw it Happen* anthologies. They were predicated upon the notion that eyewitness accounts have an especial authority. But an eyewitness to a given event is not omnipresent, much less omniscient;⁴⁸ and two people witnessing the same event may produce quite different

accounts. In similar fashion, people in the same university department are bound to have different perceptions of specific events and the overall tenor of the department, depending on temperament, the extent of everyday involvement, and vantage point.⁴⁹

As anthropologist George Stocking acknowledged with regard to an episode in his own career: "It would not surprise me if colleagues who were 'there' have different memories of this 'event'" — the "event" being the mutual agreement between Stocking and his colleagues that "it would be better for the department, and for me, that they looked for someone else [to be department chair]."⁵⁰ And, as Palmer points out, "departments are sometimes divided between those who wish to see it as a harmonious body and those who emphasize its disputatious side." There is no master narrative. As it happened, several members of the Princeton history department told Palmer that his account "brought back fond memories of people they had known a long time ago and captured the unique character of the department." His respondent's strictures are implicitly repudiated by his colleagues, who were also "there" as participants and eyewitnesses.⁵¹

Differing perceptions can apply to people as well as to situations. Take the example of people's reactions to E.H. Carr (1892-1982). When reviewing Jonathan Haslam's biography of Carr, R.W. Davies was overtly critical of the biographer's depiction of his subject. Both Davies and Haslam knew Carr but in different contexts and capacities, and from different vantage points: Davies collaborated with Carr between 1958 and 1968 on the final two volumes of Carr's monumental *History of Soviet Russia*; Haslam was Carr's PhD student. Davies writes:

In the 1960s I was an unknown historian, over thirty years younger than the eminent Carr, but he encouraged me in the criticisms of his drafts, however sharp. Our close collaboration, in spite of disagreements, was almost entirely smooth and trouble-free. Haslam knew Carr only in the last decade of his life, when he was irritated and frustrated by the tribulations of old age (he was 81 when he agreed to supervise

11 JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL BIOGRAPHY

Haslam's PhD thesis!). This, together with a rather naïve concept of human psychology, may have led Haslam to exaggerate Carr's personal defects.⁵²

In acknowledging Davies' assistance, Haslam did add the qualification that "I know he does not share my perspective."⁵³ But this was no safeguard against a severe response, which extended to criticism of Haslam's evaluation of Carr's oeuvre. It is a revealing instance of how defensive academics can be about their work, and how protective they can be of a colleague, mentor or friend.

Historians, in short, have to confront both temporal and cultural distance. In regard to González's biographical work on the historian Raymond Carr, both had to bridge cultural distance. Carr, an Oxford historian, had written seminal work on Spanish history, and was well known in Spain. González, who wrote her biography first in the Spanish language, knew of his work and got to know him and his academic environment. González describes herself, in relation to Carr as "a youngish middle-class foreigner woman." In writing her biography, González was confronted with unfamiliar territory and had to engage with the milieu of the male-dominated University of Oxford and Carr's various other English associations. As one of her reviewers put it, she was obliged to come to grips with:

the rural West Country of [Carr's] childhood, the English class system, educational opportunities in the 1930s, social mobility, Wellington College, the Gargoyle Club, Rosa Lewis at the Cavendish, four Oxford colleges, Giraldo and his orchestra, G.D.H. Cole, John Neale, Hugh Trevor-Roper, A.J. Ayer, John Sparrow, A.L. Rowse, Oswald, Diana and Nicholas Mosley, Isaiah Berlin, Margaret Thatcher and even the Queen. In academia and society—mostly high—here comes everybody.⁵⁴

González's contribution also highlights various issues surrounding the relationship between biographer and subject. Biographers who write about a living person or deal with close family of the subject harbour at times desires to escape such close engagements.

One art historian, after the death of her biographical subject, exclaimed with relief at a workshop: “the dead have surrendered their stories.”⁵⁵ On the other hand, biographers who never met their subject always wish they had—at least we have never heard of a biographer stating they were *advantaged* by not knowing their subject.

In relating to a living subject, González experienced some of the difficulties. She clearly admired Raymond Carr for his historical work. Equally, she disliked some of the things about Carr and his milieu. As well as Carr’s womanizing are the frivolities and affectations of the University of Oxford, its misogynistic attitudes, the atmosphere of snobbery and the pervasiveness of malicious gossip—although her criticisms are implied rather than expressed. Despite such off-putting features, Oxford was, says González, “a world that I had to make my own, intellectually at least.” Nor was it helpful that Carr, as a living subject, “blew hot and cold” about the project, not always taking it seriously and sometimes telling González that everything she needed to know could be found in his writings.

It seems that, in Carr’s opinion, personal acquaintance was not essential for a good and sound biography. He evidently had in mind a purely intellectual biography along the lines, say, of C.T. McIntire’s *Herbert Butterfield*. McIntire largely eschews discussion of Butterfield’s private life. At one point, McIntire says: “The voyeur will not be able to gaze on Butterfield’s domestic and emotional life with the sort of material that filled perhaps a third of Jonathan Haslam’s biography of E.H. Carr, Butterfield’s contemporary and critic in Cambridge.”⁵⁶ Actually, Haslam set out to write an intellectual biography but his book “inevitably turned into something else.” That “something else” most definitely resulted in a more satisfying biography.⁵⁷ In similar fashion, the most satisfactory article-length assessments of historians combine a reading of their personal papers with their published output.⁵⁸



Issues of gender are raised in the collection throughout. Male historians writing about men give insights into shared or diverging manifestations of masculinity. An absence of any explicit discussion of gender in this regard is already a comment on the status of men in the profession of history and academia at large. It is still mostly a male-dominated domain.

Both Palmer and González address the issue of women academics and historians' auto/biography. González notes the low incidence of female historians as biographical subjects, and recognises that "women biographers, like myself, are contributing to this state of affairs by choosing male subjects—although some of us are sensitive to and concerned about the matter and openly discuss it." An appendix to her contribution reveals that twenty-three women historians have written book-length biographies of male counterparts, as against twelve biographies of female historians by female authors.⁵⁹ These figures, which are confined to the monograph literature, represent a rather conventional way of thinking about biography and women historians writing biography.

An alternative route might be to follow the *Companion to Women's Historical Writing*, which includes biographical and auto-biographical writings. This corpus challenges the traditional narrow definition of "history" by exploring the ways in which women writers have negotiated and changed this ostensibly masculinist genre, and by exploring the relationship between feminism and the development of "women's history."⁶⁰

The situation has changed since John Kenyon wrote *The History Men* (1984), a book almost exclusively about male historians—dozens of them, with passing mention of five women.⁶¹ Despite Kenyon's solitary assertion that misogyny held women back and restricted their entry into the academy, there has never been a scarcity of women historians. But until more recently they mostly functioned outside the university system, were typically regarded as "amateurs," and thus tended to have little standing in the male dominated profession.⁶² Theirs were marginal spaces and side fields.

Prominent historians such as Mary Spongberg, Barbara Caine and Ann Curthoys, for example, argue that feminist critique leads to different ways of writing biography and autobiography.⁶³ Women scholars of late have been celebrated collectively in group biography, biographical dictionaries, and online collections.⁶⁴ In this way the elitism of the monograph, a form that enshrines the primacy of the “one single hero,” is undermined. This different approach reflects partly a need to “excavate” and reinsert forgotten woman historians, but also a different appreciation of the role of movements and groups in supporting women’s opportunities and work.

When we shift our gaze to anthropology we see a different pattern and a considerable number of biographies on women anthropologists, especially since the latter decades of the twentieth century.⁶⁵ Women have been welcomed in anthropology, which is admittedly a smaller field than history. This is not to deny that restrictive regulations hampered the development and growth of individual anthropologists such as Catherine Berndt. Gray’s contribution on Ronald Berndt reveals the extent to which Catherine Berndt subordinated her career for the sake of her husband’s professional advancement. Her partnership with Ronald may have provided some access to research opportunities, and she was still able to function as a working anthropologist, but her work was constrained by male-dominated arrangements and was frequently unpaid. She put Ronald’s career first for complex reasons—partly because of regulations at the time barring married women from university employment; partly, it seems to have been a conscious choice on her part. When in 1965 the University of Western Australia changed its regulations, she decided against applying for a tenured position. By then, her view was that younger women should have this opportunity to progress.⁶⁶

Women academics as subjects for more conventional biographical writing are not lacking. Some, such Helen Taft Manning (1891-1987), despite having a long and successful career as a professor and administrator at Bryn Mawr College, are still awaiting a book-length biography.⁶⁷ Another long time professor at Bryn Mawr, the anthropologist Jane C. Goodale (1926-2008), also lacks a biogra-

phy, although she has been the subject of a short biographical essay and a “collography”—a collaboration between the interviewer and interviewee—in a *Festschrift*, and has produced occasional autobiographical writings.⁶⁸

Thinking the Twentieth Century, by historian Tony Judt (1948–2010) with the assistance of Timothy Snyder, is likewise a collography. This work shows the potential for reflection in such special collaborative work involving intense interviewing and debating. Snyder states in the foreword: “This book arose ... because at a certain point that November I understood that Tony would be incapable of any further writing at all, at least in a conventional sense. I proposed to Tony that we write a book together.” Snyder calls the outcome a “long conversation” between the terminally-ill Judt and himself. “The resulting book,” Snyder writes, “is history, biography and ethical treatise.”⁶⁹



The question of source material bears discussion. Winter and Hughes are on different errands and their research varies from that of González and Palmer. In recounting her experiences with her engaged and conscientious dissertation supervisor Hank Nelson, Winter engages in a mix of intellectual history, biography, and especially autobiography. Winter examines the problem of distance and closeness through a conversation between historians across age, hierarchy, culture, nationality, and gender. The boundaries between the genres of biography, autobiography and intellectual history are always porous. She brings into play the relevant literature and archival documents, but Winter’s main source is her own memory. As Nelson died in 2012, he could not provide his own perspective on the circumstances Winter describes, although we suspect it would not have materially differed—other than in outlook. Winter makes such differences the centre of her story.⁷⁰ Murray’s short reminiscence on George Rudé is also largely based on memory. Hughes’s contribution on the activism

of Howard Zinn, by contrast, lies more in the realm of intellectual history. Although Hughes relates the life to the work in ways that go beyond McIntire's refusal to enter into domestic and emotional life, his sources are overwhelmingly the multitudinous writings of his subject, including a play.⁷¹

Gray and Munro have consulted a broad archive of personal and institutional papers in their contributions on anthropologist Ronald Berndt and historian George Rudé. Moreover, Gray has conducted informal interviews with some of Berndt's colleagues and contemporaries, who were reluctant to have their views and opinions on record. Anthropologists love gossip, but are careful about what they say if they know it is to be quoted or recorded.⁷²

Palmer has not been able to avail himself of such records to the same extent—for example, he found the papers of C. Vann Woodward (1908-99) “disappointing: they contain a lot of professional shoptalk and plans for programs and panels at meetings, but very little about his own life or that of his departments, either at Johns Hopkins or at Yale.” Similarly, the papers of George Pierson (1904-93) of Yale University “included little personal correspondence, and the correspondence itself had virtually nothing that would expose [Pierson's prejudice and snobbery], which I had no trouble finding out from interviews with Yale faculty members who knew him.” Gray and Munro have had different experiences, finding the contents of personal papers integral to their work.

Even so, there can be difficulties: the Berndts have restricted access to their papers until thirty years after their deaths; another prominent anthropologist, Ian Hogbin (1904-89), cleansed his archive, leaving only the barest trace of his working and personal life; Mervyn Meggitt's (1924-2004) wife abided by his request to destroy his personal papers and field notes on his death. One could argue that the archives left behind by academics are autobiographical artefacts. How historians, in turn, who are familiar with the scope and potential uses of personal papers, have shaped their own archive with future historians in mind is another matter altogether.

As well as conducting archival research, Munro interviewed or corresponded with numerous associates of George Rudé. There were some discrepancies in the responses. It was not just a matter that the reminiscences of Rudé's old comrades, at his memorial service, were sometimes exaggerated and on other occasions were downright wrong. In one instance—concerning the 1988 George Rudé Seminar—the testimony of two respondents is contradictory at several points. That said, the oral testimony was unexpectedly rich in this particular instance. Normally, however, Gray and Munro's work on academic careers and the politics of academic appointments is less dependent on oral testimony and overwhelming on recourse to personal and institutional papers.⁷³

The papers of Raymond Carr are not extensive. To overcome this limitation, González interviewed or corresponded with over one hundred individuals, consulted numerous sets of personal and institutional papers, and engaged in “optical research”—the term coined by a biographer of Mary Queen of Scots who “visited every conceivable castle, quagmire, byre or whatever associated with the Queen in three countries.”⁷⁴ González followed the injunction, attributed to R.H. Tawney (1880-1962), that historians buy a stout pair of boots. Palmer also made extensive use of interviews for his two books on facets of the historical discipline; his was a two-pronged approach, something like that adopted by Daniel Snowman for his published interviews.

Palmer's study of the post-World War II generation of historians in Britain and the United States (*Engagement with the Past*, 2001) involved, first of all, a reading of the selected historians' texts. Palmer is well equipped to engage in trans-Atlantic research of this sort: as well as being grounded in British (and Irish) and American history, he is an accomplished historiographer.⁷⁵ He then conducted interviews—sometimes face-to-face but mostly over the telephone. His subsequent book concerning a selection of the more prominent history departments in the United States (*From Gentleman's Club to Professional Body*, 2008) is also partly based on relevant secondary sources—not least historians' auto/biographies—and again the core source is the interviews. Many interviews from Palmer's initial pro-

ject have fed into the second book. Over the years he interviewed dozens of historians, sometimes more than once, and his efforts have resulted in an impressive body of data. Nonetheless, his bounty came with a measure of pain and he frankly describes some of his tribulations, starting with his disastrous first interview. Relating to informants was not always easy and he found the impersonal medium of a telephone interview, as opposed to face-to-face-interviews, initially disconcerting. He also had to learn by trial-and-error how to conduct an effective interview, especially to allow the interviewee to tell his or her story rather than trying to impress by displays of his own erudition. He brings out into the open, and with refreshing candour, some of the hidden difficulties of research.



Questions of reputation and representation are at the heart of auto/biographical practice.⁷⁶ Reputation is implicit in most of the articles in this special issue, although Berndt's reputation is the explicit focus of Gray's article. Gray analyses the construction of an academic curriculum vitae and its strategic use to advance a career. Berndt was not unique in this respect; the temptation exists for academics, especially historians, who know about the limitations and opportunities of documentation and how to construct the past, to apply their skills to their own career-building vitae. The anthropologist, art collector and academic Ronald Berndt kept up a lifelong deceit and Gray questions why this was maintained long after it was necessary. As a collector, Berndt equipped himself with markers of identity, such as the fob-watch, pipe, and hand-made chopsticks, which he carried in his top pocket. Gray raises the problem of how a biographer ought to deal with such a deceit, a deceit that over time came to be accepted as the truth upon which an academic reputation rested and indeed the foundational theme of Berndt's life. The fabrication is until today carefully defended and patrolled by Berndt's colleagues

and former pupils. The issue is made even more complex by the fact that Berndt went on to achieve professional success that dwarfed the modest achievements to which he earlier made claims. Truth about one's own life seems especially important in a discipline that depends upon truthful depictions of other lives. In the case of the Australia historian Manning Clark, his narrating of the German November Pogrom as if he had been there when he had not started a debate about the value of his life's work—which was taken up with gusto by those politically opposed to him.⁷⁷

Christine Winter's article on Hank Nelson considers how his professional relationships and scholarship are intertwined. The article is a double biographical take: it examines the relationship of supervisor and PhD student, in a mixture of biography and autobiography, and focuses on a group biography of Australian and German men brought together by war and circumstances in an ambivalent allegiance. Both levels of analysis reverberate with the theme of uneasy relationships, and the importance of the narrator. His or her national background, cultural baggage, and gendered position count. Winter quotes Walter Benjamin:

a story sinks into the life of the narrator to be transmitted to those who listen as experience. A trace of the narrator sticks to it like the trace of a potter's hand to an earthen bowl.

The ongoing conversation holds conflicting views of the past together, and situates the biographer in a chain of listening and narrating that includes the subject as well as the readers. In the article, the constructed first voice narrator, Winter, has the last word. The title of her article, however, indicates that another answer and another question is bound to follow.

Interestingly, the writing of the article provoked attacks on Winter's own reputation: a male colleague accused her of having invented parts of the conversation with Nelson. "Hank" never said such things to him, he asserted, and "Harry" (the missionary Freund) would never have "lied." In his opinion, Winter was "wrong in fact and focus." The relational aspect of the piece provoked relational

ownership, which in turn is truthful in its own right and pays tribute to Nelson's personal and engaging dealings with colleagues and members of a wider public. This episode also illustrates that biographers by no means have the last word on their subject.

Representation is closely bound up with reputation. During George Rudé's long career, opportunities, adversaries and political opposition combined to create a roller-coaster of change in academic fortunes—a "strange career," as the title suggests. It is a Cold War story of stifled academic freedom and a story about character, hard work and perseverance. Rudé had the tenacity to continue his craft and writing whether he found academic acceptance and career rewards or not. Munro, himself a historian, becomes another voice in the story of changing appreciation and abandonment of histories and historians. Provocatively he states that he is illustrating "a fundamental truth... that historians and their works are fleeting and ephemeral."

The hero worship of yesteryear has been replaced by a more cynical outlook on human nature and also by an inclination to probe into previously off-limits areas such as sexuality.⁷⁸ A given individual's reputation can slide from glorification to ridicule, as changeably as the weather. The idea that a scholar's reputation can ultimately be established and set in stone is fallacious, although sentiments to this effect have been expressed: "Future generations of scholars will place him, as we cannot, in his ultimate niche."⁷⁹ Rather, reputation is unstable and contested, with ebbs and flows, a moving target.

Most biographical writing on academics enhances a subject's reputation, often rehabilitating or seeking to maintain the subject's standing, and sometimes explaining why a scholar has slipped beneath the radar of posterity.⁸⁰ Debunking biographies are in a distinct minority and are most commonly motivated by a desire to diminish or even destroy a reputation that a biographer feels is undeserved. As Hughes shows, many of the critiques of Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United State* are so inspired.⁸¹ Zinn took risks. He was positioned, writing partisan histories from the bottom up, from the other side of a colonial America, racially divided and economically

unequal. With the metaphor of the locomotive he located power not with political leaders, but citizenry, and the destination of that train was to be greater justice and equality. As happened to many activist academics, Zinn became the target of an FBI investigation. The Bureau kept a file on him that steadily grew throughout the 1950s and 60s, creating a *doppelgänger* on paper that sometimes resembled, sometimes distorted, him. A non-existent sister was even featured in the file.⁸² In this collection, Hughes addresses a different set of concerns, attending to Zinn as a person, thinker and activist, and Zinn as an inspiration and challenge for scholars today. Although not uncritical of aspects of *A People's History of the United States*, Hughes provides a sympathetic portrayal of Zinn's activism, concluding on a triumphalist note: "Perhaps it [the revolution] will never come, and all too many scholars will continue to be content with interpreting the world, rather than trying to change it. Those who choose otherwise, however, can take both inspiration and instruction from the life and work of Howard Zinn."



This collection of present day historians writing about historians of the past is located in a time of restructuring of universities, a process that is changing the purpose of higher education, including history. Within the new corporate universities the discipline of history has struggled to defend its usefulness, and historians have reflected on their changed circumstances. The New Zealand historian Nicholas Tarling has pointed out that "Universities have changed, even though retaining the name. They have become more like corporate bodies with top-down management, and the knowledge they purvey has been commodified. History is not doing well in this environment."⁸³ In this vein, the Italian historian Francesco Boldizzoni states:

It is often said that history matters, but these words are often little more than a hollow statement.... The historian, as a public intellectual, is just as powerless as the child in Andersen's tale. Nevertheless, he is in the position to say that the emperor is naked. This will not stop the procession, but at least the others will know.⁸⁴

Boldizzoni also asserts that "history is both a search for meaning and an injection of antibodies." Likewise, David Mills, who has written a group biography of British-based social anthropologists between the 1930s and 1960s, places his work in a wider analysis of the "intricate and unique intellectual ecosystems that higher education institutions nurture and protect." The context is the self-reflections of "scholars in the humanities ... on their intellectual role, their relationship to the world and their disciplines' potential contribution to it."⁸⁵ Recently there has been increasing interest in the histories of universities, the tracing of scholarly connections and networks, and the development and expansion of academic disciplines.⁸⁶ *Telling Academic Lives* is a contribution that asserts the importance of the humane, and brings individual historians into focus through historical biography.

Notes

- ¹ E.H. Carr, *What is History?* (London: Macmillan, 1961), 34-38.
- ² Barbara Caine, *History and Biography* (Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1.
- ³ Emmanuel Lévinas, *Entre Nous: Thinking-of-the-Other* (London: Continuum: 2006), 161.
- ⁴ Caine, *History and Biography*, 3.
- ⁵ María Jesús González, *Raymond Carr: La Curiosidad del Zorro: Una Biografía* (Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg/Madrid: Círculo de Lectores, 2010); González, *Raymond Carr: The Curiosity of the Fox*, transl. Nigel Griffin (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2013); González, *El universo conservador de Antonio Maura: Biografía y proyecto de Estado* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1997).
- ⁶ William Palmer, *Engagement with the Past: The Lives and Works of the World War II Generation of Historians* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001); Palmer, *From Gentleman's Club to Professional Body: The Evolution of the History Department in the United States, 1940-1980* (Charleston, SC: BookSurge Publishing, 2008).
- ⁷ The published version of the dissertation is *Looking After One's Own: The Rise of Nationalism and the Politics of the Neuendettelsauer Mission in Australia, New Guinea and Germany (1921-1933)* (Germanica Pacifica series, 9. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 2012). The introduction is structured as an autobiographical explication. Christine Winter uses autobiographical elements throughout her historical work. See for example, "Changing Frames: Identity and Citizenship of New Guineans of German Heritage during the Inter-War Years," *Journal of Pacific History* 47:3 (2012): 347-67.
- ⁸ The contribution is drawn from Ron Hughes, "A Clear and Present Concern: The 'New History' of Howard Zinn," MA thesis, Simon Fraser University, 2014.
- ⁹ Geoffrey Gray, "'You are ... my anthropological children': A.P. Elkin, Ronald Berndt and Catherine Berndt, 1940-1956," *Aboriginal History*, 29 (2005): 77-106, which discusses patronage and the Berndts' early careers.
- ¹⁰ The remoter origins of Murray's first book—*The Right-Wing Press in the French Revolution, 1789-1792* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1986)—stemmed from Rudé's supervision of his Honours thesis at the University of Adelaide.
- ¹¹ Saul Friedländer, *When Memory Comes* (New York: Avon Books, 1980); Frank Diamond (director), *When Memory Comes: A Film about Saul Friedländer*, Icarus Films, 2014, <http://icarusfilms.com/new2014/saul.html>
- ¹² Don Aitkin, *The Second Chair* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1980).

- ¹³ Lawrence S. Wittner, *What's Going On At UAardvark?* (Troy, NY: Solidarity Press, 2013); Wittner, *Working for Peace and Justice: Memoirs of an Activist Intellectual* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2012), 103-04, 108.
- ¹⁴ *Times Higher Education*, 20 November 2014. The following were selected as exemplars of the campus novel: Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown at Oxford* (1861); Vladimir Nabokov, *Pnin* (1957) and *Pale Fire* (1962); Howard Jacobsen, *Coming from Behind* (1983); Linda Grant, *Upstairs at the Party* (2014). <https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/university-life-which-works-of-fiction-are-most-telling/2016967.article>
- ¹⁵ González, *Raymond Carr*, 185.
- ¹⁶ Ian Carter, *Ancient Cultures of Conceit: British University Fiction in the Post-War Years* (London: Routledge, 1990); Elaine Showalter, *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel and its Discontents* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009). See also Wendy Robbins in collaboration with Robin Sutherland and Shao-Pin Luo, "Search for Our Alma Maters: Women Professors in Canadian Fiction Written by Women," *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes* 42:2 (2008): 43-72; Diane Bjorklund, "Sociologists as Characters in Twentieth-Century Novels," *American Sociologist* 32:4 (2001): 23-41.
- ¹⁷ For example, G.D. Lillibridge, "So Long, Maestro: A Portrait of Merle Curti," *American Scholar* 66:2 (1997): 263-70; John Pettegrew, "The Present-Minded Professor: Merle Curti's Work as an Intellectual Historian," *History Teacher* 32:1 (1998): 67-76. Journal articles dealing with more than one historian usually focus on their writings and influence rather than their lives *per se*. For example, see David W. McIntyre, "Clio and Britannia's Lost Dream: Historians and the British Commonwealth of Nations in the First Half of the 20th Century," *Round Table* 93, no. 376 (2004): 517-32; Ethan Katz, "Displaced Historians, Dialectical Histories: George L. Mosse, Peter Gay and Germany's Multiple Paths in the Twentieth Century," *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 7:2 (2008): 135-55.
- ¹⁸ For example, Barry Hill, *Broken Song: T.G.H. Strehlow and Aboriginal Possession* (Sydney: Knopf, 2002); Michael W. Young, *Malinowski: Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1881-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)—this is only volume one; Richard Parker, *John Kenneth Galbraith: His Life, His Politics, His Economics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Mark McKenna, *An Eye for Eternity: The Biography of Manning Clark* (Melbourne: Meigunyah Press, 2011); John Lewis Gaddis, *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (New York: Penguin Press, 2011); Susan Howson, *Lionel Robbins: A Life in Economics, Government and the Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Jeremy Adelman, *Worldly Philosopher:*

- The Odyssey of Albert O. Hirschman* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).
- ¹⁹ Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars*, 2nd ed. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2004); Bain Attwood, *Telling the Truth about Aboriginal History* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2005).
- ²⁰ Jennifer Scanlon and Sharon Cosner, eds, *American Women Historians, 1700s-1990s: A Biographical Dictionary* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press 1996); Deborah Gray White, ed., *Telling Histories: Black Women Historians in the Ivory Tower*, (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).
- ²¹ For example, Marcus Cunliffe and Robin W. Winks, eds, *Pastmasters: Some Essays on American Historians* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969); Hartmut Lehmann and James J. Sheehan, eds, *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933* (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, & Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Keith Wilson, ed., *Forging the Collective Memory: Government and International Historians through Two World Wars* (Providence/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996).
- ²² R.M. Crawford, Manning Clark and Geoffrey Blainey, *Making History*, with an introduction by Stuart Macintyre (Ringwood: McPhee Gribble/Penguin Books, 1985). Of particular note is a trio of compilations of autobiographical chapters that appeared under the imprint of The History Institute, Victoria (Australia)—Bain Attwood, ed., *Boundaries of the Past* (1990); Bain Attwood and Joy Damousi, ed., *Feminist Histories* (1991); Bain Attwood, ed., *Labour Histories* (1994).
- ²³ Geoffrey Gray, ed., *Before It's Too Late: Anthropological Reflections, 1950-1970* (Sydney: Oceania Monograph no. 51, 2001); see also Terence E. Hays, ed., *Ethnographic Presents: Pioneering Anthropologists in the Papua New Guinea Highlands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
- ²⁴ Geoffrey Gray, Doug Munro and Christine Winter, eds, *Scholars at War: Australasian Social Scientists, 1939-1945* (Canberra: ANU E Press, <http://press.anu.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/whole3.pdf>).
- ²⁵ “Centenary Conference: Hugh Trevor-Roper, 1914-2014,” University of Oxford, 18 January 2014. The proceedings of the Trevor-Roper conference were published in the *Journal of Modern European History* 13:4 (2013): 407-32.
- ²⁶ “History after Hobsbawm Conference,” Institute of Historical Research, London, 29 April–1 May 2014. A “Forum: On Eric Hobsbawm (1917-2012)” was published in the *Journal of Modern European History* 11:4 (2013): 407-32.
- ²⁷ Owen Holland and Eoin Phillips, “Fifty Years of E.P. Thompson’s *The Making of the English Working Class*: Some Field Notes,” *Social History* 39:2 (2014):

173-74 & n.7, itemise the commemorative activities and symposiums occasioned by the silver jubilee of E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class*, to which can be added the symposium in *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 10:3 (2013): 27-56.

- ²⁸ D.A. Low, ed, *Keith Hancock: The Legacies of an Historian* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001).
- ²⁹ Nicholas Thomas and Diane Losche, eds, *Double Vision. Art Histories and Colonial Histories of the Pacific* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- ³⁰ For example, Golfo Alexopoulos, Julie Hessler and Kiril Tomoff, eds, *Writing the Stalin Era : Sheila Fitzpatrick and Soviet Historiography* (New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 197-236 (ch.12, "Reminiscences").
- ³¹ Gatherings include: "History and Biography," Institute of Historical Research Winter Conference, 8 March 2013. In July 2015 a workshop on historians' auto/biographies will be held at the Australian National University under the sponsorship of the National Centre for Biography (ANU) and the Gorsebrook Research Institute (St Mary's University, Nova Scotia). Also noteworthy is the Biography Workshop with Sheila Fitzpatrick, who will discuss her three autobiographies—*My Father's Daughter: Memories of an Australian Childhood* (2010), *A Spy in the Archives* (2013), and *On Stalin's Team: The Years of Living Dangerously in Soviet Politics* (due for publication by Princeton University Press), National Centre for Biography, Australian National University, 30 April 2015.
- ³² Popkin, *History, Historians, & Autobiography*. See also Jaume Aurell, *La Historia de Espana en Primera Persona: autobiografías de historiadores Hispanistas* (Barcelona: Base, 2012); Mitchell B. Hart, "The Historians' Past in Three Recent Jewish Autobiographies," *Jewish Social Studies* 5:3 (1999): 132-60; Mark Freeman, "Clio-biography," *Social and Cultural History* 1:3 (2004): 333-40; F.A. Mouton, "'History, Historians and Autobiography': A South African Case Study," *African Historical Review* 39:1 (2007): 59-79; Richard Vinen, "The Poisoned Madeleine: The Autobiographical Turn in Historical Writing," *Journal of Contemporary History* 46:3 (2011): 531-54; Doug Munro, "Reflections on Recent Auto/Biographies of Canadian Historians," *Acadiensis* 42:1 (2013): 195-210; D.L. LeMahieu, "'Scholarship Boys' in Twilight: The Memoirs of Six Humanists in Post-Industrial Britain," *Journal of British Studies* 53:4 (2014): 1011-31. Contributions from other disciplines include Cynthia G. Franklin, *Academic Lives: Memoir, Cultural Theory and the University Today* (Athens/London: University of Georgia Press, 2009); Patrick Laviolette, "Anthropology in the UK: Never Mind the Biographies, Here's the Reflexive Symbols," *Reviews in Anthropology* 37:2-3 (2008): 231-58.

- ³³ Jeremy D. Popkin, "Historians on the Autobiographical Frontier," *American Historical Review* 104:3 (1999): 732-33.
- ³⁴ Crawford, in *Making History*, 35.
- ³⁵ Pierre Nora, ed., *Essais d'ego-histoire* (Paris: Gallimard: 1987), 5-7; Luisa Passerini and Alexander C. T. Geppert, "Historians in Flux: The Concept, Task and Challenge of Ego-histoire," *Historien* 3 (2001): 7-18. See also Vanessa Castejon, Anna Cole, Oliver Haag and Karen Hughes, eds, *Ngapartji Ngpartji: In Turn in Turn: Ego-histoire, Europe and Indigenous Australia* (Canberra: ANU Press, 2014), <http://press.anu.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/whole2.pdf>
- ³⁶ Popkin, *History, Historians, & Autobiography*, ch. 2 ("Narrative Theory, History and Autobiography"); Popkin, "Ego-histoire and Beyond: Contemporary French Historian-Autobiographers," *French Historical Studies* 19:4 (1996): 1139-67.
- ³⁷ Particularly worthy of attention is Jeremy D. Popkin, "Invitation to Biography: History, the Historian, and Autobiography," *Rethinking History* 14:2 (2010): 287-300.
- ³⁸ The numerous autobiographical accounts of historians-as-activists, in addition to Zinn, include August Meier, "Introduction: A Liberal and Proud of It," in *A White Scholar in the Black Community: Essays and Reflections* (Ahmerst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 3-38; Lawrence S. Wittner, "Combining Work as an Historian and Activist: A Personal Account," *Peace & Change* 32:2 (2007): 128-33.
- ³⁹ Eg. Laura Troiano, "Slippery When Wet: A Young Historian's Journey into the World of Creative Non-Fiction," *Rethinking History* 16:1 (2012): 91-108.
- ⁴⁰ The reticence in L.P Curtis, Jr., ed., *The Historians' Workshop: Original Essays by Sixteen Historians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), where the contributors largely confine themselves to discussing their careers, contrasts with the greater personal openness in James M. Banner, Jr. and John R. Gillis, eds, *Becoming Historians* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 2009), and especially Laura Lee Downs and Stéphane Gerson, eds, *Why France? American Historians Reflect on an Enduring Fascination* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 2007).
- ⁴¹ An unusual case of junior academics being involved is the transcription of a taped discussion: Teresia Teaiwa, Robert Nicole and Alumita Durutalo, "It Ain't Heavy, It's Our History: Three Young Academics *Talanoa*," *Journal of Pacific Studies* 20 (1996): 258-82.
- ⁴² The National Library of Australia's Oral History and Folklore Collection has had a long-standing policy of nominating specialist interviewers rather than only academics. Prime examples of video interviews are the series by Alan Macfarlane "Film Interviews with Leading Thinkers,"

- <http://sms.cam.ac.uk/collection/1092396>; and Harry Kreisler "Conversations with History," <http://conversations.berkeley.edu/content/about-harry-kreisler>
- ⁴³ Roger Adelson and Russell Smith, "Videotaped Interviews with British Historians, 1985-1998," *Albion* 31:2 (1999): 260.
- ⁴⁴ Daniel Snowman, *Historians* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). By way of clarification, the 28 interviews conducted by Snowman on behalf of *History Today* are different from the 28 interviews organized by the Institute of Historical Research, which have been referred to previously.
- ⁴⁵ Richard J. Evans, *Cosmopolitan Islanders: British Historians and the European Continent* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- ⁴⁶ On this very question, see J.H. Hexter, *The History Primer* (New York: Basic Books, 1971), 278-79.
- ⁴⁷ William Palmer, "Carl Bridenbaugh, American Colonial History and Academic Antisemitism: The Paths to 'The Great Mutation,'" *American Jewish History* 98:3 (2014): 154.
- ⁴⁸ "I lived through *the whole of it*, being of an age to comprehend events, and giving my attention to them in order to know the exact truth about them." (*Peloponnesian War* 5.26.5; Strassler ed., 316 (our emphasis). The first part of the statement is nonsense. Thucydides was not in all places at all times.
- ⁴⁹ For example, Gene A. Bruckner, Henry F. May and David A. Hollinger, *History at Berkeley: A Dialog in Three Parts* (Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education, and Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, 1998).
- ⁵⁰ George W. Stocking, Jr., *Glimpses into my Own Black Box: An Exercise in Self-deconstruction* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010), 111-13 & 113n.
- ⁵¹ See also James M. Banner, Jr., "The Almost Nonexistent History of Academic Departments," *Historically Speaking* 14:4 (2013): 14-15, which focuses on the Princeton history department.
- ⁵² R.W. Davies, "Review Essay: E.H. Carr," *Russian Review* 59:3 (2000): 445.
- ⁵³ Jonathan Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity: E.H. Carr, 1892-1982* (London/New York: Verso, 1999), xii-xii.
- ⁵⁴ Malcolm Deas, review (of *Raymond Carr: The Curiosity of the Fox*), in *Spectator* 31 August 2013, <http://www.spectator.co.uk/books/9004641/raymond-carr-by-maria-jesus-gonzalez-review/>
- ⁵⁵ Personal recollection of Christine Winter.
- ⁵⁶ C.T. McIntire, *Herbert Butterfield: Historian as Dissenter* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2004), xvi.
- ⁵⁷ Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity*, xii.

- ⁵⁸ For example, John Robertson, “Hugh Trevor-Roper, Intellectual History and ‘The Religious History of the Enlightenment,’” *English Historical Review* 124, no. 511 (2009): 1389-1421; Peter Ghosh, “Hugh Trevor-Roper and the History of Ideas,” *History of European Ideas* 37 (2011): 483-505; Ian Christie, “Some Origins of a Tudor Revolution,” *English Historical Review* 126, no. 523 (2011): 1355-85.
- ⁵⁹ A similar pattern emerges in Douglas Farnie, “Biographies and Autobiographies relating to Economic Historians,” in Pat Hudson, ed., *Living Economic and Social History* (Glasgow: Economic History Society, 2001), 441-43.
- ⁶⁰ Mary Spongberg, Ann Curthoys and Barbara Caine, eds, *Companion to Women’s Historical Writing* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005). See also Judy G. Batson, *Her Oxford* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2008); Beryl Hughes and Sheila Ahern, *Redbrick and Bluestockings: Women at Victoria, 1899-1993* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1993).
- ⁶¹ John Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1984).
- ⁶² The relevant studies are as varied as: Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997); Julie Des Jardins, *Women and the Historical Enterprise in America: Gender, Race, and the Politics of Memory, 1880-1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Patricia Loughlin, *Hidden Treasures of the American West: Muriel H. Wright, Angie Debo, and Alice Marriott* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005); Nina Baym, *Women Writers of the American West, 1833-1927* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011); Susan Reynolds Williams, *Alice Morse Earle and the Domestic History of Early America* (Amherst/Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013).
- ⁶³ Spongberg, Curthoys and Caine, *Companion to Women’s Historical Writing*; Caine, *Biography and History*.
- ⁶⁴ See, for example, White, *Telling Histories*.
- ⁶⁵ It is a smaller field. Nonetheless there is a proportionally greater representation of women biographies and autobiographies. Eg. Sally Cole, *Ruth Landes: A Life in Anthropology* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); Julie Marcus, *The Indomitable Miss Pink: A Life in Anthropology* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2001); Richard Fardon, *Mary Douglas: An Intellectual Biography* (London: Routledge, 2001); Desley Deacon, *Elsie Clews Parsons: Inventing Modern Life* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1999); David Wetherell and Charlotte Carr-Gregg, *Camilla: C.H. Wedgwood 1901-1955: A Life* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1990). Autobiographies include T. Scarlet Epstein, *Swimming*

- Upstream: A Jewish Refugee from Vienna* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2005); Hortense Powdermaker, *Stranger and Friend: The Way of an Anthropologist* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1966). The many works on Margaret Mead include her autobiography *Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years* (New York: Morrow, 1972, and subsequent editions), and Jane Howard, *Margaret Mead: A Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984).
- ⁶⁶ B.K. deGaris, ed., *Campus in the Community: the University of Western Australia, 1963–1987*, (Nedlands: UWA Press, 1988), 103, 105, 245; Patricia Crawford and Myrna Tonkinson, *The Missing Chapters: Women Staff at the University of Western Australia, 1963-1987* (Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1988), unpaginated; Robert Tonkinson, e-mail to Geoffrey Gray, 24 May 2004.
- ⁶⁷ The most comprehensive information on Manning is in John G. Reid, “Imperial Women: Collective Biography, Gender, and Yale-trained Historians,” to be presented at the Workshop on Biographies and Autobiographies of Historians, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, 4-5 July 2015. Manning was still actively publishing in her eighties: “Lord Durham and the New Zealand Company,” *New Zealand Journal of History* 6:1 (1972): 1-19; “The Present State of Wakefield Studies,” *Historical Studies* 16, no. 63 (1974): 277-85.
- ⁶⁸ Laura Zimmer-Tamakoshi and Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, eds, *Pulling the Right Threads: The Ethnographic Life and Legacy of Jane C. Goodale* (Urbana/Chicago: Illinois University Press, 2008); Jane Goodale, “The Tiwi Dance for the Dead,” in Gray, *Before It Is Too Late*, 44-51.
- ⁶⁹ Tony Judt with Timothy Snyder, *Thinking the Twentieth Century* (London: Vintage Books, 2012), ix-x.
- ⁷⁰ Winter had sent the draft to a number of Nelson’s colleagues for comments. The different responses, particularly in regard to gender, surprised her.
- ⁷¹ Zinn was able to write so much, his biographer points out, because he avoided archival work. Martin Duberman, *Howard Zinn: A Life on the Left* (New York: The New Press, 2012), 25, 217, 226.
- ⁷² Geoffrey Gray, *A Cautious Silence: The Politics of Australian Anthropology* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2007), vi. Jeremy Beckett interviewed fellow anthropologist Ian Hogbin toward the end of his life. Beckett hoped to find the person he engaged with at the dinner table: “combining the talents of host and cook, connoisseur and raconteur, he has elevated the dinner party to a fine art.” Unfortunately, Hogbin closed up once the tape recorder was placed in front of him. See Jeremy Beckett, *Conversations with Ian Hogbin* (Sydney: Oceania Monograph no. 35, 1989), ii.
- ⁷³ For example, Geoffrey Gray and Doug Munro, “Australian Aboriginal Anthropology at the Crossroads: Finding a Successor to A.P. Elkin, 1955,”

The Australian Journal of Anthropology 22:3 (2011): 351-69; Gray and Munro, "Establishing Anthropology and Maori Language (Studies), Auckland University College: The Appointment of Ralph Piddington, 1949", *Histories of Anthropology Annual*, 7 (2011): 49-82; Munro and Gray, "Ron Crocombe and Harry Maude," in *Ron Crocombe e Toa: Pacific Writing to Celebrate his Life and Work*, ed. Linda Cowl, Marjorie Tuainekore Crocombe and Rod Dixon (Suva: University of the South Pacific Press, 2013), 485-503; Gray and Munro, "'The department was in some disarray': The Politics of Choosing a Successor to S.F. Nadel, 1957," in *Anthropologists and their Traditions across National Boundaries*, ed. Regna Darnell and Frederic W. Gleach (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 41-71.

⁷⁴ Antonia Fraser, "Optical Research," in *Lives for Sale: Biographers' Tales*, ed. Mark Bostridge (London: Continuum, 2004), 113.

⁷⁵ William Palmer, *The Political Career of Oliver St. John, 1637-1649* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993); Palmer, *The Problem of Ireland in Tudor Foreign Policy, 1485-1603* (Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 1994. Palmer's historiographical articles include: "Edmund Burke and the French Revolution: Notes on the Genesis of the *Reflections*," *William Colby Library Quarterly* 20:4 (1984): 181-90; "How Ideology Works: Historians and the Case of British Abolitionism," *Historical Journal* 52:4 (2009): 1039-51; "Aspects of Revision in History in Great Britain and the United States, 1920-1975," *Historical Reflections* 36:1 (2010): 17-32.

⁷⁶ Explicit discussions include C.L. Mowat, "Baldwin Restored?" *Journal of Modern History* 27:2 (1955): 169-74; Cynthia F. Behrman, "The After-Life of General Gordon," *Albion* 3:2 (1971): 47-61; Philip Williamson, "Baldwin's Reputation: Politics and History, 1937-1967," *Historical Journal* 47:1 (2004): 127-68; Richard Toye and Julie Gottlieb, eds, *Making Reputations: Power, Persuasion and the Individual in Modern British Politics* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005); Doug Munro, "J.C. Beaglehole: Reputation, *Fortuna* and Biography," *Journal of Historical Biography* 2 (2007): 1-32, http://journals.ufv.ca/jhb/Volume_2/Volume_2_Munro.pdf; Michael A. Penman, "Robert Bruce's Bones: Reputations, Politics and Identities in Nineteenth-Century Scotland," *International Review of Scottish Studies* 34 (2009): 7-73.

⁷⁷ See Mark McKenna, "Once More With Feeling: The Personal Voice of Manning Clark," in *Against the Grain: Brian Fitzpatrick and Manning Clark in Australian History and Politics*, ed. Stuart Macintyre and Sheila Fitzpatrick (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2007), 191-222. On the problem of truth and truthfulness, see for example Tessa Morris-Suzuki, "The compulsions of Un-remembering: Politics, Media and History in Japan," paper presented at the Symposium, *Scales of Memory: Violence, (In)Justice and*

Dynamics of Remembrance, 10-12 December 2014, Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University. See also J.A. Barnes, *A Pack of Lies: Towards a Sociology of Lying* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

- ⁷⁸ Max Jones, "What Should Historians Do With Heroes? Reflections on Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Britain," *History Compass* 5:2 (2007): 439-54; *European History Quarterly* (special issue on "Hero Cults and the Politics of the Past: Comparative European Perspectives") 39:3 (2009); *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* (special issue on "Decolonising Imperial Heroes: Britain and France") 42:5 (2014).
- ⁷⁹ Leonard W. Labaree, "Charles McLean Andrews," *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, 1:1 (1944): 14.
- ⁸⁰ For example, David Cannadine, *G.M. Trevelyan: A Life in History* (London: HarperCollins, 1992); Jim Davidson, *A Three-Cornered Life: WK Hancock the Historian* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2011); Andrew M. Johnston, "The Disappearance of Emily G. Balch, Social Scientist," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 13:2 (2014): 166-99.
- ⁸¹ On "Zinn-bashing," see Robert Cohen, "The Second Worst History Book in Print? Rethinking *A People's History of the United States*," *Reviews in American History* 42:2 (2014): 197-206. Interestingly, James W. Loewen's critique of US history textbooks, which is congruent with Zinn's line of thinking, has not been accorded the same degree of hostile attention as *A People's History of the United States*. See Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* 2nd ed (New York: Touchstone Books, 2007 [1995]).
- ⁸² Matthew Rothschild, The FBI's File on Howard Zinn, *The Progressive*, 31 July 2010, <http://www.progressive.org/node/146176/14010>.
- ⁸³ "Scholarly Viewpoints with Nicholas Tarling," *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 8:2 (2012): 177, <http://ijaps.usm.my/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/NicholasTarlingViewpoints.pdf>
- ⁸⁴ Francesco Boldizzoni, On History and Policy: Time in the Age of Neoliberalism, MPIfG Discussion Paper 13/6, Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Cologne June 2013: 1, 11, http://www.mpi-fg-koeln.mpg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp13-6.pdf.
- ⁸⁵ David Mills, *Difficult Folk? A Political History of Social Anthropology* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 1.
- ⁸⁶ Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); Glenda Sluga, *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Gray, Munro, and Winter, eds., *Scholars at War*.