

The Strange Career of George Rudé— Marxist Historian*

Doug Munro**

AT A MEMORIAL MEETING IN HONOUR OF GEORGE RUDÉ (1910-93) at Marx House in London, a number of his old comrades condemned the manner in which he had been deprived of employment and honours in his own country. They were referring to Rudé being “blacklisted” from university positions in England on account of his membership in the Communist Party of Great Britain. He was consigned to secondary school teaching but somehow managed to write important historical works throughout the 1950s—and still he was denied a university appointment: “a disgrace to the academic community in this country,” said one of the speakers.¹ The aging Marxist historians at the memorial meeting were anxious to maintain the rage and were unforgiving that one of their number had suffered so much from “the vileness of the ’50s.” But for the good fortune of Rudé getting a suitable position at the University of Adelaide (in South Australia), from which so much followed, he would likely have remained a schoolteacher and something of an outcast from university life. It was deeply regretted at the memorial service that such a fine scholar and such a thoroughly decent man was deprived of academic employment in England and forced to spend most of his life in “exile,”

Doug Munro, “The Strange Career of George Rudé—Marxist Historian,” *Journal of Historical Biography* 16 (Autumn 2014): 118-169, 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/).

working in overseas universities. By this means he avoided what his good friend Eric Hobsbawm (1917-2012) described, in a slightly different context, as a “ghetto reputation” within the historical profession.²

Perhaps the best short assessment of Rudé’s significance comes from an unlikely quarter, none other than the conservative historian Norman Cantor (1929-2004):

Among the leading scholars of the postwar generation who have been engaged in examining the social history of the [French] Revolution is the British scholar George Rudé.... [His] studies of the nature of the crowd in the French Revolution and his parallel studies of the crowd and popular movements in Britain in the late-eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries have been widely recognized as contributions of the highest importance. Rudé joins a small but growing group of historians who wish to depart from the traditional elitism of the historical profession and try to get at the organization and behavior of the common man. This is easy to advocate but difficult to accomplish—the source material is hard to get and even harder to interpret. But Rudé, making use of such unusual materials as police records, has illuminated the popular side of the Revolutionary era—undoubtedly its most significant side. Rudé is a patient, modest, good-humored man, with a firm but undogmatic commitment to the contemporary Left.³

Rudé’s own description of his approach appeared in an autobiographical essay:

What I learned from Marx was not only that history tends to progress through a conflict of social classes (a view, incidentally, that was held to be perfectly “respectable” a hundred years ago) but that it has a discoverable pattern and moves forward (not backwards, in circles or in inexplicable jerks) broadly from a lower to a high phase of development. I learned also, that the lives and actions of the common people are the very stuff of history, and though “material” actions rather than institutional and ideological factors are primary, that ideas themselves become a “material force”

when they pass into the consciousness of men. Moreover, I have also learned from Engels that, whatever the excellence of historical “systems” (like his own and Marx’s, for example), “all history must be studied afresh”. What I never at any time learned from either of them was that history should be interpreted in terms of narrow economic determinism.⁴

To which he added:

I did not approach my subject without commitment.... This does not mean that I have ever felt *politically* involved with the wage-earners, craftsmen or rioters with whom I have largely been concerned, but that I have always felt a bond of sympathy with them, whether their activities have been peaceful or rebellious. A recent reviewer ... wrote of my “nostalgia and affection for the class of artisan-craftsman now vanished from our technological society”; and I would not wish to deny the charge. So, although my work has always (to historians, at least) a sociological flavor, I have never felt in any way inclined to share the views of those American social scientists to whom riot and rebellion have appeared as an abnormal and distasteful deviant from “a stable, self-regulating state of perpetual equipoise.” I believe, on the contrary, that conflict is both a normal and salutary means of achieving social progress, and I have not hesitated in looking back on the past to identify myself more closely with some parties in the conflict than with others.⁵

The intention in this paper is biographical rather than historiographical. I will not be discussing Rudé’s oeuvre, except incidentally. There have been numerous assessments and re-assessments.⁶ In the austere spirit of revisionism, some of the reappraisal has been quite critical.⁷ Rather, the focus will be on the course of Rudé’s career as an academic historian. Within four years of his appointment to a senior lectureship at the University of Adelaide in 1960, he was promoted to full professor; he went on to further professorships at three other universities—as foundation professor at Stirling (1968); at Flinders University of South Australia (1968-70); and at Sir George Williams University/Concordia University in Canada (1970-85),

where he saw out his career. Such progression and mobility was remarkable even for those days. In short, a career that might never have taken off, because of Cold War anxieties, turned out very well indeed.

Much has been written about Rudé, not least by James Friguglietti who stated that Rudé liked to quote Engel's maxim that "all history must be studied afresh:"

The same observation might be made about Rudé himself. His life must also be "studied afresh" using new material that awaits discovery. Only then will we truly understand the man whose scholarly achievements are familiar but whose biography remains to be written.⁸

The present paper takes a small step in that direction. Modest though my intentions are, the vagaries of the evidence have created difficulties. As one of George Orwell's biographers observed, "One only has the evidence that one can find"⁹—and not only the surviving evidence but what a southern hemisphere researcher can access. It has certainly been a hindrance that two of the four universities where Rudé worked (Stirling and Flinders) have not retained his personal files, where consolidated and sequential information will be found in the one place. And neither can Hugh Stretton's notes of his interview with Rudé, for his contribution to the latter's *Festschrift*, be located.¹⁰ There is an unevenness in the record—adequate source material for some episodes and a scarcity for others.

Attempting to reassemble Rudé's academic career is beset by evidential problems of another kind. If the written evidence is patchy, the reliability of memory is suspect at times. The memorial service was "an amazing event," in the words of Rudé's nephew, who was in attendance,¹¹ but the speakers' memories were not always accurate. Also, it proved unexpectedly difficult to assemble an accurate chronology at certain points. Unquestionably, the helpfulness of archivists, as well as the generosity of colleagues in passing on sources, in alerting me to information and informants, and their willingness to be interviewed, have made this paper a feasible undertaking. Serendip-

ity, as well as the largess of others, has been unexpectedly friendly to my research. Nonetheless, questions of evidence are a constant theme in the present investigation. Recurring questions arise around various pieces of evidence—their status *as evidence*.



There were no early indications that George Frederick Elliot Rudé would become a communist and a historian. He started off as a schoolteacher of modern languages and, if anything, a conservative. Born in Norway in 1910, he arrived in England at age nine. The household was genteel but by no means wealthy: his Norwegian father, an engineer, made little money and the family was held together financially by his mother's modest private income.¹² He went to Shrewsbury School on a scholarship (1924-28), then to Trinity College, Cambridge, on another scholarship, where he gained an upper second honours degree in French and German in 1931. The following year he became a language teacher at Stowe School in Buckinghamshire.¹³

To that point, Rudé was more interested in art galleries than in political engagement. As explained by Hugh Stretton, his colleague and close friend and at the University of Adelaide:

at a party in London in the summer of 1932 he chanced to meet an amiable young athlete from Oxford who was about to visit Russia and who persuaded him to join the same conducted tour. What he saw in Soviet Russia and learned from his touring companions in those six weeks changed his life: he set out uninterested in politics and mildly impressed by Mussolini and came back a committed communist and anti fascist.¹⁴

The story has been embellished in subsequent retellings. John Saville (1916-2009) tells us that he “always regretted [not asking Rudé] about the famous visit to Russia in 1932, when the party he went with included David Low and Kingsley Martin.”¹⁵ Had he asked, Rudé

would have offered the gentle correction that he and his companion were not among the group of journalists (for which there is a full listing) on board the Russian steamship *Alexis Rykov*, under the auspices of the Soviet tourist agency Intourist. Rather, the pair was among the hundred or so tourists, including a leading King's Counsel, and three candidates for Parliament at the previous general election.¹⁶ Although an on-line search has not revealed outgoing or incoming passenger lists for the voyage, Rudé confirms in his Communist Party résumé that he did actually visit Russia in 1932.¹⁷

A plausible conjecture for Rudé's initial attraction to communism is that the seeming optimism of Russia under the first Five Year Plan contrasted with the bleakness of Depression-time England. As a close colleague of Rudé's remarked in the 1960s, "He always [struck] me as exactly the type of best public-school Communist of the inter-war years, when both the international and the English scenes were of course very different from now; it was often the more sensitive and intelligent young men who were attracted to the U.S.S.R."¹⁸ The trip to Russia made a lasting impression but Rudé did not immediately join the Communist Party of Great Britain. Only after reading the Marxist classics and a period of deliberation was he prepared to take the plunge, in mid-1935. In short order he became Chair of the Party's Westminster Branch, and in late 1936 he was arrested and fined £5 for his part in the Cable Street protest against the march of Oswald Mosley's Blackshirts into the East End of London. He commenced his formal communist education by attending sessions of the Party's International, National and District Schools, and became active in other facets of the Party's work. His personal life also blossomed with his marriage in 1940 to Doreen de la Hoyde, with whom he remained for the rest of his life. She never joined the Party, or any political party, preferring to be an "independent radical."¹⁹

Rudé's wartime occupation was with the National Fire Service.²⁰ Nonetheless, his Communist Party activities continued, and then intensified after the war. To add to a hectic life, Rudé had become bored with teaching modern languages—he probably also wanted to take his Marxism further—and enrolled as an external student for a BA in History at the University of London, graduating with another upper second class honours degree in 1948. The wonder is

where he found the energy to engage in what Stretton has described as his “treble life” as schoolteacher, external university student, and active Communist Party functionary.²¹

St Paul’s School in London, where Rudé had been teaching since 1936, was aware of his communist leanings but turned a blind eye because “he did not preach it in the Common Room” or mention it in the classroom. He strictly divided his activism, being a sleeping communist at his workplace and an active communist outside office hours. But in early 1949, an appalled parent saw Rudé on a street platform wearing a Party placard and reported the matter to the school. Rudé was given the ultimatum to either cease his Party activities or tender his resignation. Adamant that he would not turn his back on the Party, and wanting more time for the PhD thesis upon which he had embarked, it was amicably agreed that Rudé would “leave in good order six months later.”²² His resignation letter stated that, “I have wished for some time to devote myself more fully to research work for my PhD degree [at University College, London]. As this will entail some residence abroad in the near future, I wish to take this opportunity of giving you the necessary notice.”²³ In evidence of the school’s high regard for Rudé’s teaching (and doubtless also because he was prepared to go quietly), the High Master of St Paul’s gave Rudé a glowing testimonial, explaining that the school was no longer able to offer him other than very limited teaching work: “In these circumstances his desire to seek a post elsewhere offering wider scope for his abilities is a most natural one, and I fully agree with his decision to move, though much regret the reason.”²⁴ Nothing was said about Rudé’s out-of-school political activities. The school clearly did not wish to blight his future career, said nothing about his out-of-school activities, and was generous enough to pay his salary until the end of the year, although he had departed mid-year.



With this leeway, Rudé was able to submit his PhD thesis in 1950 on “The Parisian Wage-Earning Population and the Insurrectionary Movements of 1789-91.” The thesis is based largely on judicial and fiscal records in French archives; and Rudé continued his work in Paris for the purpose of researching journal articles and revising his PhD for publication. The questions he asked concerning “the nature of the crowd” were basic but not easily answered: “How were the crowds composed...? Who led them or influenced them? What were the motives that prompted them? What was the particular significance and outcome of their intervention?”²⁵ His methodology involved a degree of quantification and therefore the use of sources beyond the more traditional ones, including “police, prison, hospital, and judicial records; Home Office papers and Entry Books and the Treasury Solicitor’s reports; tax rolls; poll books and petitions; notarial records; inventories; parish records of births, deaths and marriages; public assistance records; tables of prices and wages; censuses; local directories and club membership lists; and lists of freeholders, jurymen, churchwardens and justices of the peace.”²⁶

Rather than stereotyping the crowd in the manner of many previous historians as a rabble-rousing “mob,” Rudé made it clear that he “felt a bond of sympathy with them, whether their activities [were] peaceful or rebellious.”²⁷ It is evident that his decision to turn to the study of history was a delayed reaction to events in the 1930s. He attributed his becoming a historian to “reading of Marx, and probably Lenin as well,” which was a consequence of his visit to Russia in 1932. There is every likelihood, moreover, that his involvement in the Cable Street disturbance imparted a sense of affinity toward “the crowd,” allowing him to identify with the political and social protesters he would later be writing about.²⁸ The episode enabled him to see many protesters as respectable and gentlemanly, and fighting an honourable cause. It also sparked the realization that authority rather than the “mob,” was the principal perpetrator of violence. One reviewer described Rudé as being possessed of “a radical form of romanticism,”²⁹ and it is plausible that he created “the faces in the crowd” somewhat in his own image. The Cable Street episode

also resulted in Rudé being apprehensive of mounted constabulary, having been in near proximity to baton-wielding police on horseback.

He also researched British political history, with his study of the politician and agitator John Wilkes—not intended as a biography of Wilkes but a study of the Wilkes movement—and he was active in that remarkable cluster, the Historians' Group of the Communist Party. As Eric Hobsbawm has said, he filled the eighteenth-century void in the Group's interests: "we simply had nobody who knew much about it until George Rudé, a lone explorer, ventured into the period of John Wilkes."³⁰

In 1950, Rudé obtained another teaching position at Sir Walter St. John's School in London and (presumably during the long vacations) made extended visits to the Paris archives in 1951, 1953 and 1957, particularly to the Archives Nationales. He dresses these trips up in his autobiographical essay as awfully big adventures, and they were. There was the thrill of the chase as he ransacked one archive after another. There was the camaraderie of shared archival adventures with Albert Soboul (1914-82) and Richard Cobb (1917-96), two other historians working on adjacent areas of the French Revolution. Above all, there was the kindly support and hospitality of Georges Lefebvre (1874-1959), the great historian of the French Revolution and its agrarian dimension.³¹

A string of journal articles appeared, but attempts to gain university employment were unsuccessful. It is at this point that the evidential problems become acute: allegations abound but details are hazy or non-existent. There are two accusations. One was that any known communist was prevented from obtaining a university position during the 1950s. The other is that Alfred Cobban (1901-68), Rudé's PhD supervisor at the University of London, blackballed him.

The first allegation has been expressed in general terms by Hobsbawm:

In Britain, anyone lucky enough to get into the university [system] before the early summer of 1948, when the curtain went down, on the whole stayed [down]. They didn't get promotion for ten or eleven years, but they weren't thrown

out. There were one or two cases of people who did get thrown out, but on the whole most of us who were lucky enough to get in stayed in. We had to sit it out. But it's equally clear that nobody who wasn't in by, I suppose, May/June 1948—the time of the Berlin airlift—got a job for ten or eleven years.³²

The theme of Rudé's exclusion from gainful university employment permeated the speeches at his 1993 memorial service. "His story during the 1950s," said John Saville, "...exemplifies the moral weaknesses within British academe, which were to be demonstrated once again in striking ways during the dismal decade of the Thatcher years."³³ Saville went on to say that communists were excluded from university teaching positions:

[I]n the usual British gentlemanly fashion, and in the university sector it was mostly done by easily coded phrases in testimonials and references, or by telephone conversations in well modulated accents. There were some well-known Labour intellectuals who would include a note in a reference to the effect that, while they themselves would not be influenced by the fact, it must be mentioned that the candidate was a Communist.³⁴

Christopher Hill (1912-2003) sought to convey "just a little bit more indignation than has already been expressed at the outrageous treatment that [Rudé] received":

Because they are done in a gentlemanly way, and because nobody asks any questions about them, we think that that is just the way things are in England; it's not like McCarthyism, where there is open political hatred, which can then be disavowed afterwards. The British McCarthyism isn't ever disavowed because it never comes to the surface.³⁵

Eric Hobsbawm also asserted that Rudé's growing publication record "didn't help. Plenty of excuses: chap coming over late; ... many years at a comprehensive school [Holloway, in London]; wasn't even teaching history but language. Any excuse."³⁶ These objections might

seem valid, but Hobsbawm's essential point was that Rudé, having conducted so much important research of his own volition and without institutional support, was deserving of a fair hearing.

The resentment is palpable and the general truths unassailable, although the improbability of a non-communist landing in an academic job behind the Iron Curtain does not seem to have crossed their minds. And as Hobsbawm himself pointed out, "this was not yet a time when all people with a serious interest in history automatically envisaged a university career, since openings were few, except in university-linked adult education departments into which a number of the ablest went.... An even larger number became schoolteachers, at least for a time."³⁷

But where is the hard evidence for Rudé's tribulations during the 1950s? This is not a matter of setting impossible standards of evidence but a case of asking for firm evidence of any sort. Symptomatic is the wonderfully evocative obituary in the *Guardian*, where Hobsbawm refers to "[t]he hundred failed job applications of the cold war years."³⁸ At the memorial service, Hobsbawm inflated the figure to "the innumerable universities, polytechnics and other places to which he applied in those days."³⁹ No specific examples are provided as to which universities turned him down, for what positions, and when. It may be wondered whether as many as a hundred history jobs were actually on offer during that decade; and even if they were, many would not have been within Rudé's areas of teaching competence. For the sums to add up, Rudé would have applied for about one position per month had he been seeking university employment continuously from 1951 to 1959. The only university jobs in England for which he applied that I have been able to document are for unspecified positions at Cheswick Polytechnic in west London in 1953, and at Cambridge University in an unstated year. The referee for the Cheswick position was his former headmaster at St Paul's School.⁴⁰

The second allegation—that Rudé was stymied by his former supervisor—led to Cobban being denounced at the memorial service. Hobsbawm stated Cobban seemed to end up with a bad conscience about it. Saville said that Cobban, "as we all know," dobbed him in to

selection committees as a communist, and enigmatically added that “Cobban never forgave him.”⁴¹ Never forgave him for what? One longs to have specifics. Hobsbawm did state that Rudé was excluded from Cobban’s seminar after the Hungarian uprising of 1956; and one of Rudé’s referees for the Adelaide job mentioned that “Cobban is prejudiced [against Rudé] by Hungary.”⁴² Cobban had by then emerged as a leading critic of the Marxist interpretation of the French Revolution with his inaugural lecture at London, which was delivered in 1954 and entitled “The Myth of the French Revolution.”⁴³ From these slivers of evidence it seems that Cobban, who may already have been bothered about Rudé’s Communist Party membership, was antagonised because he had neither condemned the Soviet intervention in Hungary nor resigned from the Party.

Ironically Rudé was already having doubts about organised communism, as distinct from the creed of communism. He had been rather shaken by Khrushchev’s “secret” speech in early 1956 denouncing Stalin, whose economic strategies and wartime leadership had evoked his admiration.⁴⁴ The suppression of the Hungarian uprising also gave him a jolt, but bonds of loyalty and fraternity prevented him from advertising the fact.⁴⁵ Whereas communist historians such as E.P. Thompson and Christopher Hill resigned from the Party, Rudé and Hobsbawm stayed on. Rudé would have made life easier for himself by renouncing his communist faith, or at least resigning from the Party, or better still getting himself expelled, but that was not his way. He probably felt, as did Hobsbawm, that Party membership no longer meant what it had in the 1930s, and he “ceased to take an active part in politics” after 1956.⁴⁶ Hobsbawm was on the mark in observing that “the main thing George got from being a communist was a hard deal.”⁴⁷ Even so, on his deathbed Rudé said to his wife, “Doreen, if I had to do it again, I’d be a better Communist,” and he left £1000 to the Party in his will.⁴⁸

Rudé himself says nothing about any of this. His autobiographical essay is the last place to look for evidence of his tribulations. He does not mention the visit to Russia in 1932 as the catalyst for his Marxism; instead of denouncing Cobban, he thanks him for

assistance rendered (and in fact Rudé contributed to the Cobban *Festschrift*); he does not draw attention to being let go at St Paul's School; he explains away his delayed start to academic life by passing himself off as "a late developer" who wrote his first article at the age of forty-two and his first book some nine years later; and he does not mention any of the universities where he worked. There are no actual untruths in Rudé's autobiographical essay but he conveys many misleading impressions. The explanation for these silences and evasions is that Rudé was a remarkably good-natured person, not one to hold grudges. As Hobsbawm remarked, "the least likely thing he would have said ... is: 'I'll never forgive that bastard for what he did to me',"⁴⁹ presumably a reference to Cobban.

A clue to the way events might have unfolded is provided by Stretton's statement that Rudé began to apply for academic jobs "[t]owards the end of the 1950s."⁵⁰ This would probably apply to university rather than to polytechnic positions: it ties in with the timing of Cobban's hostility, and also with Rudé's increasingly impressive publication record.⁵¹ In the early-1950s, Rudé might have struggled to be looked at for a university position. He had started publishing but only in the French language in *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* (Georges Lefebvre's journal), which may not have counted for much in England. Furthermore, his PhD thesis was a long way from publication because he needed to increase the temporal span and the thematic spread to make it publishable.⁵² But he was gradually building up his academic credentials. From 1953 he was placing articles in mainstream English journals and in *History Today*. The notable exception was *History: The Journal of the Historical Society*, which Cobban edited. Rudé emphatically announced his entry into eighteenth-century English history with his 1956 essay on the Gordon Riots, which won the prestigious Alexander Prize of the Royal Historical Society.⁵³ His CV was getting ever stronger. It took enormous commitment for a schoolteacher to conduct out-of-office-hours research *and* to write up the results; and it was fortunate that all the schools in which he taught were in London or nearby. Not

only was he within striking distance of France but the local archival repositories were on his doorstep.

He clearly wanted an academic position and was giving lectures and seminar presentations in order to enhance his marketability (and sometimes to augment his income); these he itemized in his application to the University of Adelaide:

I have read papers and given talks and lectures on French and British Eighteenth Century History to seminars and groups of graduates and students at Oxford and at the University of London; to post-graduate students at St. Catharine's [College, Cambridge], Cumberland Lodge, The Great Park, Windsor; to secondary teachers at London County Hall; to the Royal Historical Society; to Branches of the Historical Association in London, Middlesex and Kent; and to discussion groups conducted by the Workers' Educational Association. I have also lectured on the teaching of History to graduates at the Department of Education, Birmingham University.⁵⁴

Added urgency was provided by his physical condition. As a result of an accident on a walking holiday on the Continent he had developed phlebitis—an inflammation of a vein in the leg—and he was finding it increasingly difficult to stand in front of classrooms for long periods.⁵⁵

Irrespective of when Rudé actually started to apply for academic positions in England, the fact that he was unable to land one by the late 1950s becomes increasingly discreditable and lends credence to his comrades' allegations that he was victimized for his political beliefs. By the late 1950s, Rudé was well published, and there is no doubt, as subsequent events testified, that he would have been an able and congenial colleague in any history department.



Giving up on English universities as a bad lot, Rudé began looking overseas and at this point a degree of precision enters the picture. He applied for a position at the University of Colombo in Ceylon.⁵⁶ An application in 1958 to the New South Wales University of Technology was doomed before it started because the prospective employer had been forewarned by the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, itself acting on information received by British intelligence, that Rudé was a communist.⁵⁷ A University of Tasmania (UTAS) selection committee put his name forward but the University Council refused to ratify the recommendation. The relevant Council minute reads:

It was reported that the Board recommended the appointment to the Lectureship in History be offered to Dr. G.F.E. Rudé at a salary of £2050—the top of the scale for Lecturer Grade I. After a discussion of Dr. Rudé's political beliefs and affiliations, Professor Barber moved that further enquiries be made regarding this matter and that consideration of the recommendation be deferred in the meantime. Mr. Tribolet moved as an amendment that the recommendation for the appointment of Dr. Rudé not be entertained. The amendment was carried by 10 votes to 7 and, as the substantive motion, was agreed to.⁵⁸

The professor of history John McManners (1916-2006) was dismayed: Rudé's specialism in revolutionary France complemented his own interest in pre-revolutionary France and together they might have made Tasmania a significant centre of French studies. The University Council's treatment of Rudé was one aggravation too many for McManners, who left for the University of Sydney.⁵⁹ Rather than add to UTAS's woes by publicizing what had prompted his departure, McManners only revealed the reason in later years.⁶⁰ The rebuff, nonetheless, was a blessing in disguise for Rudé. In the aftermath of the dismissal of the philosophy professor Sydney Sparkes Orr in 1956, UTAS was an unhappy and divided campus.⁶¹

Rudé had also submitted an application to the University of Adelaide but was unsuccessful in the first instance. The position, a

lectureship, was offered to Trevor Wilson, who went on to become professor in 1968. Perhaps he was a closer match to the job description, but Hugh Stretton, the professor of history, had Rudé in mind for another vacancy, which he upgraded to a senior lectureship. Stretton was convinced of Rudé's worthiness, he later explained, upon reading an "untidy proof copy of *The Crowd in the French Revolution*."⁶² He also considered it a distinct advantage that an experienced high school teacher be put in charge of one of the big first-year courses.⁶³ Rudé was asked whether he wished to be considered for the more senior position, to which he was eventually appointed.⁶⁴

Australian university departments in those days almost always had a single full professor, who doubled as permanent head of department (or department chair, in North American parlance), and who had a preponderant say in the appointment of departmental staff members. In this highly personalized system, much of the correspondence with promising applicants was conducted by the head of department. Stretton's *modus operandi* in staff appointments from overseas was to seek advice from people who knew them well.⁶⁵ Regarding Rudé's suitability, it is likely that he would have contacted Christopher Hill, who had been his tutor and then colleague at Balliol College, Oxford.⁶⁶ Stretton also turned to two of the referees nominated by Rudé (amongst whom Cobban was nowhere to be seen) and he gathered the early reviews of *The Crowd in the French Revolution*, all of them favourable. The "academic" referee was Albert Goodwin (1906-95), professor of modern history at the University of Manchester and author of *The French Revolution* (1953). He was one of Rudé's PhD examiners and had "a very high opinion of his merits as a scholar." At no point in his application did Rudé draw attention to his communist associations, least of all his involvement with the Historians' Group of the Communist Party. "He is a Marxist," warned Goodwin, "but I personally don't find this intrudes in his historical writing—[although] it accounts for the bent of his researches."⁶⁷ The "personal" referee was John Bromley (1913-85) of Keble College, Oxford, who explicitly drew attention to Rudé's communist affiliations, only to explain them away in terms of endearing naivety:

There is an absolutely convincing, indeed transparent, integrity about him. With less of this he might perhaps have given up the C.P. years ago. I feel fully sure (especially in view of his age) that he was caught up in the quasi-religious left-wing movement of the Spanish Civil War period. In a sense, to my mind (though I vote Tory) his “Communism” does credit to his tender heart and a misplaced loyalty rather than suggesting anything sinister.⁶⁸

Some of the academic networks in operation—the links of filiation and friendship—can be traced. Rudé would have known Goodwin as a fellow historian of the French Revolution. Goodwin and Bromley, whose research was eighteenth-century French and English privateers, had collaborated on a book;⁶⁹ but it is not known whether Goodwin introduced the two or whether Rudé had made contact with Bromley of his own accord. Richard Cobb also comes into the picture: he and Bromley were both at Oxford, which opens the possibility that Cobb introduced Rudé to Bromley.⁷⁰ Furthermore, Bromley and McManners were close colleagues, and there is every likelihood that McManners was referring to Bromley as the friend who strongly recommended Rudé for the Tasmania position. The web of patronage expanded in subsequent years, with McManners strongly supporting Rudé’s career advancement.⁷¹

Both referees stressed Rudé’s personal qualities: “he is charming, agreeable & co-operative in every way. He would be a most engaging and impressive lecturer & most loyal,” Goodwin wrote.⁷² Bromley emphasized

not only his total freedom from ‘side’ and unselfconscious sense of equality with people much less clever or refined than himself but above all the man’s generosity, considerateness, and *open* courteous manner. He is almost embarrassingly modest but I have been struck even more by his straightforwardness.... I have never noticed an iron vizor come down over his genial features.... Incidentally, he is also an exceedingly handsome man, with a presence that carries authority.⁷³

(Michael Roe, who was appointed to the position that Rudé missed out on at UTAS, made the pertinent observation that Rudé's natural charm did not mean that he was "insincere or hypocritical, but it did have the effect that people might have thought they were more important to George than they actually were."⁷⁴)

Stretton had all the affirmation he needed. The next move was to ensure that Rudé's appointment would actually go ahead—that a similar fate would not befall him as had happened in Tasmania. It was by no means straightforward, and four and a half months elapsed between Rudé's agreement to be considered for a Senior Lectureship and confirmation of the appointment. To safeguard against sabotage, Stretton told his vice-chancellor, Sir Henry Basten, about Rudé's communism—"not so that the appointment should be prevented ... but so that those legally responsible for the appointment should know what they were doing and be prepared in advance to defend it."⁷⁵ As Stretton explained:

The Vice-Chancellor decided to conceal Rudé's Left associations from the Council, if the Chancellor and the Chairman of the Finance Committee would privately agree to do so. The Vice-Chancellor ... had previously been the British manager of the Singapore docks. The Chancellor, aged 77, was Chief Justice Sir Mellis Napier. The Finance Chief, Sir Kenneth Willis, was a millionaire who had directed Australian Military Intelligence through World War Two. They could scarcely be suspected of Leftist bias. All three put the principle of intellectual freedom ahead of their obligation to their perhaps-illiberal Council.⁷⁶

They agreed to keep the cold warriors on the council in the dark so long as Rudé's impartiality could be assured: "If you say this is an honest scholar doing his job in an honest way then I will support you," was Napier's response.⁷⁷ Enquires were then made to that effect. Rudé had been interviewed for overseas positions by the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth, and they reported:

Our advisory committees do not on principle enquire into the political affiliations of candidates except where specifically instructed to do so... but for one of these interviews a referee's report had called attention to [Rudé's] political background, and we thought it best to give him an opportunity to comment by putting ... it directly to him. He gave a quite frank answer, saying that he was a Marxist and a Communist by belief but could give an assurance that his private political opinions would not obtrude themselves on his teaching; I thought myself that this statement was made sincerely and could be accepted.⁷⁸

Two of the schools where Rudé had worked also confirmed that his political beliefs had never affected his teaching—that there was no “indoctrination of the boys or intrusion of his views into our school life.”⁷⁹ Rudé's appointment was confirmed, and with commendable under-statement he told the University of Adelaide that “I shall be very happy to accept...”⁸⁰ Game, set and match to Stretton.

These precautions probably saved the University of Adelaide from the opprobrium that would have ensued had the appointment been blocked. Both the daily press and the Federation of Australian University Staff Associations took up such matters with gusto. Shortly after Rudé's arrival, the Russel Ward case blew up in the face of the New South Wales University of Technology. Ward, a former communist, had been denied a history lectureship in 1956. In 1960 the professor of history at the time revealed what had happened, causing a public relations disaster of two years duration for his former employer.⁸¹ And in 1965 there was another messy and heavily publicized business at the University of Sydney when Frank Knopfelmacher, a fervent anti-communist crusader and a past master at character assassination, was denied a position in the philosophy department: the recommendation of the selection committee in Knopfelmacher's favour was twice overturned, ostensibly because he was deemed academically unsuitable. In reality he would have been an appalling departmental colleague and a disruptive presence on the campus.⁸² As it was, in 1961 the University of Adelaide was forced

to rescind, under duress, the appointment of Y.S. Brenner to a lectureship in economic history, because he had been a member of the Stern Gang, a militant group in the British Mandate of Palestine in the early to mid-1940s with a reputation for violence.⁸³ The bad publicity for the university would have been worse had Rudé's appointment been blocked the previous year. In all likelihood, in the Brenner case, ASIO was gaining a small measure of revenge for having been thwarted over Rudé's appointment the year before. Stretton did not win that fight, but at least there was a happy outcome; Brenner ended his career of professor of economic history at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands.

An informant within the university had alerted ASIO to Rudé's impending arrival. Because he was not coming as an assisted passage migrant, ASIO was unable to undertake a security check. The Organisation expressed dissatisfaction "that the University of Adelaide is selecting lecturers in the United Kingdom without any security check being made,"⁸⁴ which is disingenuous given the above-mentioned measures taken by the university. Knowledge of Rudé's application was widespread enough because Stretton had also forewarned his departmental colleagues of Rudé's political affiliations.⁸⁵ There is the possibility that one of them might have tipped off ASIO but the precision and accuracy of the information in Rudé's ASIO file makes it more likely that the organisation had informants planted in the University Registry. ASIO reported:

[1.] ...an Adelaide University contact has given the following information concerning the appointment of [George Rudé] to a lectureship in History at the University.

2. RUDE has openly admitted his membership of the Communist Party. Despite this, history books of which he is the author and reports of his classwork at schools in England all show that he is objective in his approach to his teaching subject and has not let his own personal politics intrude in any way.

3. His qualifications are so much higher than other applicants for his intended appointment here that the University has no option but to appoint him, short of a public upheaval

on the matter, something it does not wish to cause if RUDE continues in the way outlined in para. 2.

4. RUDE is to be warned on taking up his appointment that his past adherence to the Communist Party is known and that any demonstration of his political views at the University will probably cause his dismissal.

5. Further reports should be available concerning RUDE after he takes up his appointment in February, 1960.⁸⁶

True to its word, ASIO representatives did come on to the campus to “interview” Rudé.⁸⁷ They need not have worried, for he simply wanted to devote himself to scholarship. As Stretton explained, Rudé was glad of the opportunity to break his ties with the CPGB “without ratting on old comrades. Having necessarily left the British party when he emigrated, he simply didn’t join the Australian party.”⁸⁸ His work for the Communist Party in England had been time consuming; he had paid his dues; he had given his all; there had been disappointments. Now it was time to get on with the rest of his life. Nor was he in the business of indoctrinating students or peddling his views, as ASIO quickly realised from its several informants on the campus:

In discussion [NAME BLACKED OUT] University of Adelaide ... informed me that RUDE has been very carefully watched by himself and a number of other members of staff since he took up his appointment at the University. All have noted that he never mentions politics except temperately in his lectures, and mentions neither it nor anything in private discussions which can be construed as having Communist leanings.⁸⁹

Nonetheless, ASIO maintained a watchful eye, and on Doreen, too, when she became the president of the South Australian branch of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). ASIO got its wires crossed in a telling fashion in 1967 when Marjorie Pollitt, the widow of the longstanding General Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, came to live in Adelaide, where her married daughter Jean Suggett resided. The Pollitts and the Rudés had been friends since the 1930s, but this was no basis for an ASIO

informant mistakenly reporting that Doreen was Marjorie Pollitt's daughter. The acuity of the intelligence gatherers is underwhelming.⁹⁰

Doreen Rudé had interests beyond WILPF. She always found a life for herself wherever she accompanied George. She went with him on at least some of his research trips to Paris in the 1950s, where she studied cooking at the Cordon Bleu school. She participated in a regular radio program in Adelaide on cooking and was a marvellous hostess when she and George entertained, and companion when they went to dinner parties, both of which they often did. Lively and opinionated, she held her own with George's academic colleagues, and was at ease in their company. She was wonderful to be with, the occasional barbed comment notwithstanding. Intelligent, elegant and articulate, Doreen was her own person. At the same time she and George, despite their divergent personalities, had an undefinable yet unmistakable synergy: an intrigued Hugh Stretton described Doreen and George's relationship as "a triumph of complementarity rather than similarity."⁹¹ She was fiercely protective and in her later years she let fly at Harvey Kaye over the telephone for the lack of a chapter on George in his book *The British Marxist Historians* (1984): "We should all be lucky enough to have such women and partners in our lives!" was Kaye's reaction to his ordeal.⁹² On one occasion the department secretaries were mildly scandalized to see George and Doreen embrace in the university courtyard and exchange farewell kisses, which is a reflection on both their unabashed affection for each other and the somewhat puritanical atmosphere that pervaded Adelaide at the time.

Rudé was an instant success at the University of Adelaide. He was the "star scholarly acquisition" in a history department already bristling with talent.⁹³ He more than fulfilled Stretton's expectations in teaching the big first-year class. His published output was phenomenal, yet he never worked past six o'clock in the evening. An efficient and disciplined writer, he would arrive at the university at seven in the morning and write for the next two hours. (It helped that he had no children to worry about.) As he was a heavy smoker, other

members of faculty arriving at a more civilized time knew he was hard at it from the distinctive aroma of his Gauloises.⁹⁴ Stretton recalled Rudé's output and consistency while he was writing *The Crowd in History* (1964), a book consisting of twelve chapters of case studies and four theoretical chapters. Every second Friday he would present the office typist with a case study chapter. That done, the typist received one of the longer theoretical chapters every third Friday.⁹⁵ He also had the remarkable ability to "switch off" from the day's research and writing and, as fresh as ever, get on with other aspects of life.⁹⁶ There was no sign of overt Marxism in any of his books. To the contrary, Rudé always wore his Marxism lightly, never denying but neither flaunting it. A colleague remarked, "You'd never have known he was a Marxist from talking to him."⁹⁷

A deep and abiding friendship quickly developed between the Strettons and the Rudés. Stretton's son Tim has youthful memories of the Rudés lighting up numerous dinner parties at his parent's home and of George patiently answering his questions about a school project on the American Civil War.⁹⁸ But it was more than close friendship that led Stretton within three years to recommend Rudé for a personal chair on the grounds of his published output. The University of Adelaide had just approved the creation of personal chairs and Stretton made his case on Rudé's behalf:

I hope we may manage to keep Dr. Rudé for a few years. Besides his services to the department of history, his reputation outshines any other in the Faculty of Arts, and gives it a little of the scholarly distinction which it would otherwise lack. I do not think that a promotion to Reader would be appropriate to his merits, nor that it could compete with the offers he is now likely to get.⁹⁹

The personal chair was not approved. The following year the university made provision for more than one full professorship within departments, and Stretton successfully put the case that such a position be created within the history department. Rudé was shortlisted along with J.R. McCracken and F.S.L. Lyons, both prominent histo-

rians of Ireland. It was decided to seek the opinion of an outside assessor—namely W.K. Hancock of the Australian National University, who was regarded as Australia’s most distinguished historian. He declared that “Rudé is so obviously the best of your short-listed candidates,” adding that “I have only met him once or twice so my testimony is based altogether on his record of publication. On that count he stands well in front of the other two candidates, good though they are.”¹⁰⁰

With that, Rudé was appointed second professor. Rudé’s entry in the Staff List in the University of Adelaide *Calendar* for 1964 reads: “GEORGE FREDERICK RUDE, M.A. (Camb.), Ph.D. (Lond.), F.R.Hist.S. Appointed Senior Lecturer 1960; Professor, 1964.” Such career progression would have seemed beyond the realm of possibility even six years earlier.

Hancock observed that Rudé’s “creative continuity” meant that “[e]ach new interest which he pursues seems to arise naturally out of the previous one and at the same time strengthens it.” Rudé’s interest in popular disturbances in England led to him to follow the rioters and protesters who were transported to Australia, involving research trips to Canberra, Perth, Sydney, and especially Hobart, to consult the convict records. The visits to the Tasmanian Archives Office were not only a welcome escape from the heat of the Adelaide summers but added another string to his research bow. He was working with Eric Hobsbawm on a book on the 1830 English agricultural labourers’ uprising against mechanization, and from late 1964 to late 1965 he was on study leave in England to conduct research in the English repositories—already having researched the fate of the 460 or so who were transported to Australia.¹⁰¹ On one of his excursions to Hobart, Rudé encountered the same vice-chancellor who had helped to block his appointment at UTAS. Afterwards, the vice-chancellor pulled the new history professor, Douglas Pike (ex-University of Adelaide), to one side and said in tones of amazement, “But Pike, he’s a *gentleman*!!” struggling to comprehend that a communist could fit such a description.¹⁰²

With Stretton's impending study leave, Rudé took over as department chair in 1966. The extent of committee work and the lack of scope to delegate made the headship of any department at Adelaide burdensome. (In fact, a few years later Stretton famously relinquished his professorship and became a reader in order to escape the administrative treadmill and to free up time for his writing.) Rudé was an able and considerate department chair—although he disregarded the advice of colleagues in the disastrous appointment of a Russianist from the University of Edinburgh who “proved unstable as well as incompetent and eventually committed suicide.”¹⁰³ Rudé's writing slowed but his main concern lay elsewhere: he had completed his Australian research and he wanted to be closer to England and France for the sake of his future work. He was headhunted by the University of Stirling, the last of the “plateglass universities” cropping up in Britain as a result of the Robbins Report (1963), where it was:

agreed that the Principal should explore the possibility of offering the Chair (of History) to Professor George Rudé, at present a Professor at Adelaide. It was agreed that his standing as a historian justified making such an offer if he were willing to take a visit to Britain to discuss the position. The Chairman undertook to seek the views of the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide regarding Professor Rudé.¹⁰⁴

In April of 1967 he put in his resignation at Adelaide, effective at the end of the year, to take up Stirling's offer. There was a round of farewells come December and the university conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Letters.



But trouble was already in the offing. For the only time in their marriage, Doreen dug her toes in. During the second half of 1967, when George had a visiting professorship in Japan, Doreen went to Stirling to make forward arrangements, and she hated the place. George could

go there but she would get a flat in London.¹⁰⁵ Doreen and George had an intensely loyal and affectionate relationship—it was obvious to one and all that they adored each other as much as when they were first married.¹⁰⁶ George could have withdrawn his resignation at Adelaide and been kept on, but there would likely have been consequences had he applied for subsequent jobs in Britain. Instead, he asked Stirling before his arrival to have his professorship converted into a short-term appointment, and it was agreed that Rudé's appointment would last until September 1968. He knew there was a way out because a vacancy was in the offing at Adelaide's second university (the new Flinders University) following the sudden resignation of Oliver MacDonagh, who had returned to Ireland to be near his wife's and his own aging parents.¹⁰⁷

Shortly after arriving at Stirling, Doreen decided to give the place a chance. George then withdrew his resignation, which the university refused to accept. Stirling (or more precisely, the principal of the university, Tom Cottrell) took exception to a foundation professor resigning before any teaching had begun. With that, Rudé accepted the Flinders position, by late-March 1968 at the latest.¹⁰⁸ The incongruous aspect to the situation is that Rudé was given free rein to appoint staff and to develop the curriculum during his short time at Stirling. The key elements of the curriculum development, which lasted many years, were the focus on modern history (from the late eighteenth century) and the first year course on the French, Industrial and American revolutions.¹⁰⁹

An indication of Stirling's displeasure can be gauged from the description of Rudé in the *Annual Report* for 1967-68 as "Visiting Professor" and "our distinguished visitor" rather than "Foundation Professor" or simply "Professor," the position to which he had been appointed. His replacement was David Waddell, a Caribbeanist, who was appointed ahead of Christopher Smout. The preference for one over the other is difficult to fathom given that Smout, a reader at the University of Edinburgh, had the credentials and the personality to fill Rudé's shoes: Smout is now the Historiographer Royal in Scotland. Waddell, by contrast, was "not a tenth of the academic that

George was,” in the view of a newly arrived lecturer, Robert McKean.¹¹⁰ Another young lecturer was shocked when Waddell used a sabbatical to repaint his house.¹¹¹ The lecturers became disenchanted with “the thoroughly second-rate” Waddell, which was one of the reasons Eric Richards returned to Australia. Another reason was the arrival of the censorious Roy H. Campbell as Professor of Economic History. In short, the succession was ill-considered. McKean still feels that Stirling made “a bad mistake” in not accepting Rudé’s offer to withdraw his resignation.¹¹²

Actually, it would not have made any difference: he would have left Stirling anyway and the university’s refusal gave him an honourable way out. Remarkably, in April 1968 he received an expression of definite interest from Sir George Williams University (SGWU) in Montreal, which was looking for a senior historian of France. A member of the History faculty, Alan Adamson, contacted his friend Eric Hobsbawm, who said that Rudé was unhappy at Stirling and if they were quick SGWU might be able to grab him. Rudé was brought over to Montreal to give a formal lecture and to be interviewed. It was a perfect match. He liked the university and the people. SGWU liked him and his appointment was quickly set up.¹¹³

There were certain provisos. He was to have no administrative duties. Second, he felt honour-bound to give Flinders at least two years and it was agreed that there would be no announcement of the SGWU professorship until he had settled matters with Flinders. He also stipulated that he could not arrive until the finish of the Flinders teaching year in 1970, meaning that someone else would have to take his classes at SGWU from September until his end-of-year arrival.¹¹⁴

There is a perception that Rudé exploited Flinders, having the Canadian job in the bag beforehand, and that Flinders was merely a parking place until it became available. He did have the job in the bag, but he also fulfilled what he saw as his obligation to give Flinders two years of service rather than going to SGWU right away. There is also the point that the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five meant that Rudé would only have five further years of gainful employment at Flinders. He wanted to continue teaching beyond that

time, which was possible at SGWU on a part-time basis. Living in Canada also meant that he would be closer to his sources and better placed to travel to France—the same concerns he had at the University of Adelaide.¹¹⁵ There may also have been financial imperatives given that he had started academic life so late and would probably not have built up sufficient superannuation to provide for retirement at age sixty-five—and whether he was in receipt of Australian superannuation given his bad leg is an unknown quantity.

As it was, Rudé delayed announcing his resignation at Flinders until October 1969 (thirteen months after his arrival), presumably to avoid unsettling the history discipline with an earlier announcement.¹¹⁶ The news was received with considerable disappointment within the discipline, given the expectation that Rudé was in for the long haul. On a visit to Adelaide in September 1970, I was chatting with J.M. (Jim) Main, a reader in History at Flinders. A very urbane and civilized person, and on good terms with Rudé, Main vehemently told me, “I think George is a rotter for leaving us.”

Rudé found Flinders congenial. Crucially, he had few administrative duties by comparison with Adelaide. The history discipline was located within the School of Social Sciences, and much of the administration and its financial aspects were the responsibility of the school. He “almost chafed at having too little to do, but it didn’t take me long before I adapted rather gratefully to the ... system.”¹¹⁷ One advantage was being able to spend more time with individual students. Another was that he could get on with writing the book that would become *Debate on Europe, 1815-1850* (1972), a historiographic survey of the changing interpretations of the period. His work habits were much the same: he would arrive at Flinders at eight in the morning to clear the administration. Often he would return home in the early afternoon to continue with his writing. He was mainly interested in his own work and took little notice of what others in the discipline were doing. He was not overbearing but neither was he an interactive department chair. Regular departmental seminars, for example, only eventuated upon the arrival of his successor.

Although members of his department were left to get on with their work in the benign expectation that they would do so, he did encourage David Hilliard to apply for grants to enable the revision of his doctoral thesis, and an astonished Brian Dickey was buttonholed in a stairwell and told that he would get a salary increment for having edited a collection of documents.¹¹⁸ One way he protected his writing time was to keep the staff meetings short: he opened his first such meeting by asking what time those present thought it should end, and the decision was binding. On the other hand, he appreciated a common tearoom for the School of Social Sciences and the School of Language and Literature (subsequently renamed Humanities) where he could relate to faculty from other disciplines—in contrast to “the isolation of departments in the older universities.” The economist Keith Hancock, who was the chairman of the School of Social Sciences, recalls after all these years a tearoom conversation where Rudé engagingly held forth on the 1830 English agricultural labourers uprising.¹¹⁹

Flinders was the second “new” university where Rudé worked, with the critical difference that he started on the ground floor at Stirling whereas Flinders was already up and running; teaching had started three years earlier in 1966. The lecturers sometimes joked that he inherited a staff that he probably would not have appointed himself. He also inherited a departmental syllabus and school-wide course structures that were not to his liking.¹²⁰ Briefly, the various disciplines were located in self-contained schools, and students in one school were seldom able to take subjects offered by another school.¹²¹ As the history discipline was in the School of Social Sciences, and French and Spanish disciplines were located in the School of Language and Literature, history students could not enrol for a foreign language, except by (rarely granted) special permission. It was a bizarre arrangement. More to the point, the history syllabus created by Oliver MacDonagh overwhelmingly focused on the political history of Britain, Europe and Australia, and political theory.¹²² The only exceptions in 1969 were “Pacific History” and “The Social History of the United States.” There was also a course on “Metropoli-

tan-Colonial Relations” involving Canada, South Africa and India. This too was resolutely political history. There was scope for diversifying the history syllabus, both thematically and geographically, and making it less Eurocentric.

Rudé played a part in syllabus reform but his role should not be overstated. He did appoint two lecturers—an Asianist (a new appointment) and a Latin Americanist (who replaced a historian of sixteenth-century Spain who had returned to England). But these were in keeping with previously expressed sentiments within the history discipline. At a staff meeting in March 1968, “It was suggested that Modern Japanese History might be taught. It was also suggested that any Spanish History offered might be related to Latin America. These arrangements depend on appointments to be made.”¹²³ In other words, faculty members were anxious for change: MacDonagh had barely departed and the staff he appointed were plotting a significant modification of the syllabus he created. Rudé took the lead in syllabus reform but it was much a case of finding out what his colleagues wanted and encouraging them in that direction. It also shows that Rudé was moving with the times because he had shown little interest in non-European history at the University of Adelaide when teaching the first-year course “Europe and the World it Encountered, 1500-1800.”¹²⁴

At an early opportunity Rudé presented proposals for curriculum change, most of which were accepted. History 1B (“Political Crises” in Australia and Britain) was abolished, leaving a modified “Revolution and Independence” course as the sole first-year offering. He also wanted an arrangement whereby students with French up to school-leaving standard could take a second-year course on “Nineteenth Century French Language and History,” in conjunction with the French Discipline in the School of Language and Literature.¹²⁵ There was already the comparable offering on “Spanish Language and History,” but cross-school courses such as these were rare. In an ongoing process, “The Spanish Predominance in Europe, 1500-1650” was replaced by “Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Latin America;” China was added to the Revolutions course; and the syllabus was

broadened to include course offerings on “Race Relations in South and East Africa,” “Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines”, and “India and Pakistan,” not to mention a compulsory course on “Method and Practice in the Social Sciences” for students aspiring to an honours year.¹²⁶

A student of the time remembers Rudé as “a keen fosterer of the young” and recalls “some extremely elegant and learned lectures that were a pleasure to witness.”¹²⁷ That same student perceptively added that:

George was a gentleman. In some ways that explains his sense of equanimity. Unlike a lot of Marxists he believed manners were as important as ideas. In some respects while a superb master of the archival sources he was not the kind of deep Marxist thinker who discerns in every issue—personal as well as historical—some fundamental ideological or philosophical point.¹²⁸

Rudé did have a soft spot for left-wing and especially Marxist students; his way of encouraging them was by saying that they had to be far better, and therefore work harder, than apolitical students in order to be treated on an equal basis. He also sometimes contradicted himself in his defence of radical students, as when he clashed with one of his lecturers, Peter Howell, at an exam board meeting in 1970. Howell, who taught the political theory courses, spoke in support of a recommendation that a particular student be precluded from further study. Not only had the student failed a third-year topic twice but had not attended a single tutorial or lecture in either year. Ever-defensive of radicals, Rudé pleaded for a waving of the rules because of the student’s activism in the anti-Vietnam War movement, but the committee was unmoved.¹²⁹

Some of the students, by contrast, were very bright and hard-working and he liked the generality of students for another reason: “In those days I think students were very interesting. They were asking very searching questions about how universities should be run. They were very determined to come in on the process of decision-

making themselves in a far more active way than they had before. Personally I approved of this.”¹³⁰ On these grounds he was sympathetic to student demands for consultative committees comprising students as well as faculty—far more so than the other professors, and indeed some members of his own staff.

The demand for student participation in the governance of the school, including academic matters, crystallized in September 1969. I was a third-year student at Flinders at the time, although I had little to do with the manoeuvring over the next few weeks. But I do remember a meeting where the abolition of end-of-year exams in favour of continuous assessment was high on the agenda. The professors of geography and economics, in particular, were against such an alteration, partly because they considered exams good pedagogy, and partly because of the prevailing feeling that Flinders, being a new university, had to be better than Adelaide just to be regarded as being as good—so there could be no relaxing of standards or the procedures of assessment, or else Flinders graduates would be disadvantaged in the employment stakes. Rudé gently explained that “We have to have a way to test you.” Although he held ranks with the other professors, at least on that occasion, his approval of student demands for consultative committees sometimes got him into difficulties with some of his conservative colleagues.¹³¹

In the event, consultative committees for each discipline in the School of Social Sciences were constituted in early October.¹³² At one of the early meetings of the History consultative committee, Rudé had to parry an onslaught from one of the readers in history, Philip Lockwood, who was opposed to *any* formal consultation with students. Becoming visibly agitated by Rudé’s attitude, Lockwood expostulated, “With due respect, Mr. Chairman, I disagree entirely!” whereupon Rudé smoothed the waters somewhat by remarking, “There is a slight difference of emphasis between Mr. Lockwood and myself.”¹³³ Such a tactic was typical of Rudé’s approach. He was skilled at deflecting confrontation and defusing unpleasantness by force of a sunny demeanour and being an exponent of the soft

word—the same qualities that made him an effective chairman of Communist Party committee meetings decades earlier.¹³⁴

After Rudé's departure, but not because of it, student demands escalated into an insistence on the abolition of exams for first year history topics (as was already the case for second year topics). The history discipline was targeted and the standoff resulted in a month-long occupation of the University Registry in 1974, which would have been Rudé's penultimate year had he remained at Flinders.¹³⁵ It is doubtful whether he would have been able to stem the rising tide of student intransigence. A pretty irony would likely have unfolded—the historian who wrote in celebratory fashion about riots and popular disturbances himself being the target of one.

Certainly he was a strong supporter of students protesting against the Vietnam War: he and Doreen bailed several who were arrested for their part in anti-war demonstrations.¹³⁶ I do not know whether he participated in any of the demonstrations, although Doreen was in the biggest march through Adelaide in 1970 under the WILPF banner; his ASIO file is of no help in this regard because the Organization lost interest in him when he left for Stirling. The extent to which Rudé was integrated into Adelaide society was impressed on me when he delivered a public lecture at Flinders University in September 1969 on "The Study of Revolutions".¹³⁷ It attracted a capacity crowd at the Ann Flinders Theatre. I was surprised at just how powerful a drawcard he was, and even more surprised at the composition of the audience, which looked upper-middle-class, even upper-crust, and decidedly unradical. There was no doubting that the affable Rudé was by this time a big name around town.



George and Doreen arrived in Montreal in late-1970. He settled into his new role at SGWU (which would become Concordia University, in 1974, following a merger with Loyola College), becoming a firm

favourite with faculty and students. Although he set up the Inter-University Centre for European Studies/*Centre interuniversitaire d'études européennes*, which was headquartered at the Université du Québec à Montréal, the position involved no organizational responsibilities that would take him away from his writing. Thus he continued in full production and to encourage younger scholars. Peter McPhee recalls receiving prompt comments whenever he sent Rudé a manuscript, be they detailed suggestions or simply a heartening postcard.¹³⁸ John Reid, as a doctoral student at the University of New Brunswick in the early 1970s, attended a public lecture by Rudé and recalls “impeccable courtesy” when meeting him afterwards. He also remembers

making the point to grad student colleagues afterwards that for a radical historian to be mild-mannered and courteously affable in a very English way was not at all uncommon in the context of other left historians I had met while at Oxford. I think my colleagues had expected more of a firebrand!¹³⁹

A decade later, in 1984, Harvey Kaye arranged for Rudé to give a lecturer at the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay:

George’s lecture on the Friday morning was on “Ideologies and the Revolution of 1789”. He was fantastic. Leaning against a high stool in order to relieve the pressure on his legs, he gently placed the overflow audience of 300 faculty and students in the palm of his hand and took them on a time-travel to late eighteenth century France. He carried them from city to country, introducing them to the aristocrat and bourgeoisie, *sans-culottes* and peasant: it was remarkable. Following the one-hour talk, students eagerly approached him for autographs, as if he were a Hollywood celebrity, and of course he was handsome enough to be taken for one. They asked George to sign everything from *The Crowd in the French Revolution* to (no kidding!) *The Communist Manifesto*.¹⁴⁰

His writings were inspirational for some. As an undergraduate student at the University of Warwick in the mid-1960s, Victor Bailey

was taught by E.P. Thompson and introduced to Rudé's writings: "I was so taken by his work on crowds, that I became an instant convert to this kind of research," although Bailey did come to realise that the "moral economy" provided a far better analysis of food riots.¹⁴¹

His earlier book, *The Crowd in the French Revolution*, helped inspire another career in the historical profession. Alan Williams, a graduate student in California, had been jailed for his dissidence to the Vietnam War. Some of Rudé's wider influence may have been due to his work coinciding with the youth movement and the anti-Vietnam War protests, but in William's case it was more because of Rudé's research in the archives: "what he showed ... could be made of them I found most appealing—the way he brought back the forgotten."¹⁴² Rudé clearly caught the moment and his work struck a responsive chord with the times.

In 1975, when he reached sixty-five, Rudé shifted to part-time work at Concordia, teaching in the fall semester and spending the rest of the year in the house that he and Doreen had bought in East Sussex in the south of England—what he described as "our main habitat."¹⁴³ Then in 1978 the George Rudé Seminar was inaugurated by a group of Melbourne-based historians, with Bill Murray of La Trobe University at the forefront. This conference on "French history and civilisation" is held every second year at an Australian or New Zealand university, and so his name has been perpetuated.¹⁴⁴

In 1983, Rudé underwent surgery for a benign tumour in the pituitary gland. He made a rapid recovery and was fine for some years thereafter. But there were already signs that his work was not of its previous high standard. His book on the political and social protesters transported to Australia (*Protest and Punishment*, 1978) received distinctly cool reviews. One critic, a notoriously tough reviewer, wrote:

[the] book disappoints precisely because one is aware of the great contribution which Dr Rudé has made to this area of history in the past. It is unfortunate that he has allowed himself to become imprisoned in such rigid and inflexible categories of "protesters" versus "common-law offenders"; this

deprives him of the opportunity to use his potentially interesting source material to explore this area with the rewarding subtlety shown by ... other historians tackling this sort of question.¹⁴⁵

There was some injustice in criticizing Rudé's conceptualization without acknowledging that his methodology remained standard practice. In its time Geoff Eley regarded *The Crowd in History* as one of the three key texts, along with Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* and Hobsbawm's *Primitive Rebels*, on popular protest—although Eley does add,

I cite these works not to reclaim them for present purposes but because in and for their time, they proved vitally enabling. They pioneered the study of seemingly irrational popular rebellion by recuperating its terms of coherence and bases of action but within overarching frameworks we would now find inadequate.¹⁴⁶

There is also the point that he had made a wider impact on United States historiography along the lines suggested by Robert Dare:

If you look to George's impact in the US, I think you can argue that it was greater there than it ever was in Britain or Australia. George, unknowingly in the beginning I suspect, made a frontal assault on one sort of American exceptionalism, namely the idea that they had had a different kind of revolution. Historians had been a bit prone to contrast the random and demonic behaviour of the mob in the French revolution, immortalised by Dickens and others, with the orderly, purposeful, politically inspired and relatively peaceful action of their populations when they took to the streets. What happens to that contrast when George tells them ... [is that] the crowds in the French revolution weren't a mob, but were purposeful and targeted and increasingly political in their actions?¹⁴⁷

Nonetheless, the message was clear that the pioneering historian was now captive to his own preconceptions—a form had become a formula—and he was getting left behind, especially in the field of

criminal justice history. It was a sad finale for the person who Stuart Macintyre considers having “open[ed] up a methodology for the study of protest and in some ways prefiguring history from below. I thought him as important as Hobsbawm in the late-sixties.”¹⁴⁸ Doreen realised that George’s standards were slipping but was unable to prevail upon him to put down his pen.¹⁴⁹

There was an attempt in 1985 by friends to bring George and Doreen back to South Australia for their remaining years and to have the University of Adelaide confer upon Rudé an honorary professorship. The plans came to nothing, presumably because of pension and health-care considerations.¹⁵⁰ But he visited Australia often enough. The last time I saw Rudé was in 1988 when he gave a public lecture at Flinders University, where I happened to be on study leave. He had an astonishing effect. There was an immediate hush when he entered the lecture theatre. He then faced the blackboard and scribbled down a few things whilst the audience remained in eerie silence for what seemed an eternity. He gave a middling-to-average performance and the very sympathetic gathering made allowances that he was past his prime. Just how much past his prime became evident when he travelled on to Melbourne for the George Rudé Seminar. He stayed with Peter McPhee, who was one of the members of the organizing committee, and was “high maintenance,” although characteristically pleasant and cordial. There was concern that Rudé’s opening address might not go well. It did go well for about ten minutes before Rudé started to ramble, whereupon Bill Murray in the chair tactfully brought proceedings to a close, explaining to the audience that he was acting on “doctor’s orders” that Rudé only be allowed ten minutes of speaking time.¹⁵¹ Rudé chaired the closing address by Michel Vovele, with embarrassing results.¹⁵²

McPhee later realized that Rudé was in the grip of the early stages of the dementia that would blight the rest of his life. They were “really quite miserable years,” Hobsbawm recalled, adding that Rudé “never lost his balance, his good temper”¹⁵³—and this despite the depressing effect of the resurgence of the Right and the retreat of the Left in the Reagan-Thatcher years, and culminating in the fall of

the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the USSR. Actually, Rudé was prone to sarcasm in his later years, and his steadily decreasing capacities placed a strain on Doreen: in an exasperated moment she rounded on him quite savagely, and hated herself for having momentarily “lost it.”¹⁵⁴ A hint of his mounting incapacity can be seen in his request to Harvey Kaye, in 1985, to edit a selection of his essays rather than doing it himself.¹⁵⁵ A surer sign was his last book. He had been asked to write a second edition of *Revolutionary Europe* but the publisher was presented with essentially the same work instead of a thorough-going revision.¹⁵⁶ The person who urged that “All history must be studied afresh” was no longer able to do so. He had not lost the urge to write, but the capacity to *rewrite* now eluded him. This was implied, and none-too-gently, during Rudé’s lifetime in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Historians*, where “the originality of his earlier research” and his “widely admired and copied” methodology are contrasted to criticisms of his later work as being “superficial, both empirically and conceptually.”¹⁵⁷

He had carried on too long, or rather he should have stopped writing after the mid-1970s and concentrated on teaching. His reputation, at least in French Revolution studies, has diminished. The largely unrevised second edition of *Revolutionary Europe* did not help his cause—reviewers commented on how stale and dated was the text—but the corrosion of reputation was already evident. For one thing, he never defended himself when his work was criticized—any more than he ever wrote a hostile book review.¹⁵⁸ (Doreen would have been stauncher.) His critics were unencumbered by such gentlemanly inhibitions. Cobban, in particular, aggressively imposed his ideas on the academic marketplace and was apt to criticize differing interpretations to the point of ridicule. His most influential work in this regard was *The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution* (1964), which argued that the Revolution stemmed from political rather than social impulses. In many respects Cobban was indulging in a spoiling game: critics were of the view that his “impact on the ‘neo-Marxist paradigm’ was tantamount to the destruction of a formerly accepted scientific theory by an unbeliever who was neither

willing nor able to set up another schema in its place.”¹⁵⁹ Georges Lefebvre was the main target. Rudé was also in the firing line, although Cobban was not entirely critical of his work.¹⁶⁰ A measure of Rudé’s eclipse may be gauged from *The Crowd in the French Revolution* going unmentioned in a 1972 survey of French Revolution historiography, apart from a coded reference to “the *rudéfication* [sic] of the Crowd.” The term “*Rudéfication*” was coined by his erstwhile friend Richard Cobb, and was not intended as a compliment.¹⁶¹

It has been stated that “All historians live in the certainty that someday someone will do the historiography of what they write.”¹⁶² That is by no means an invariable certainty; there is no guarantee of entry into the canon. Historians and their works are fleeting and ephemeral. Often enough the former greats become yesterday’s men in the process of history being written afresh, and many join the great unread. Another way of looking at it is to acknowledge the “death of the author” but without the actual product being eliminated. That is to say, there is the incremental, if often indirect, contribution of the corpus of written works to the advancement of historical knowledge and understanding. We should heed what W.K. Hancock pointed out some sixty years ago—a sentiment too often disregarded—that

each generation must both examine the sources more deeply and re-examine the concepts that serve to elucidate these sources; this necessary process is marred only when the after-comers show themselves ungrateful and ungenerous toward the pioneers.¹⁶³

In Rudé’s case, his distinctive method in the study of popular protest may ultimately mean that this aspect of his work will live on longer and better than most.

Addendum: Harvey J. Kaye is George Rudé’s literary executor. He welcomes enquiries relating to Rudé’s literary estate and may be contacted at: Democracy and Justice Studies, University of Wisconsin—Green Bay, Green Bay, WI 54311, USA. kayeh@uwgb.edu

* Acknowledgments:

I particularly wish to thank the late Jean Suggett (née Pollitt) and Eric Richards for their many conversations about George Rudé. Judith Adamson went out of her way on my behalf; James Friguglietti generously shared sources; and Harvey J. Kaye and Peter McPhee were most supportive. Archivists and librarians at the University of Adelaide (Helen Bruce, Cheryl Hoskin and Susan Coppin), Flinders University (Llew Goode and Alison Peck), the University of Stirling (Karl Magee), Concordia University (Vincent Ouellette); State Library and Tasmanian Information and Research Service (Kim Pearce and Nolan Navarre); University of Tasmania (Heather Excell); and the University of Kent at Canterbury (Nicholas Hiley) were most helpful. The many colleagues who responded to my enquiries (and often made useful comments on earlier drafts) are identified in the endnotes. Frank Bongiorno, Carl Griffin, Jim McAloon, William Palmer, Robert Tristram and John C. Weaver also provided comments. Tania Fothergill, Thomas Heald and Darryl Burrowes conducted research on my behalf in Hobart, Stirling and Adelaide, respectively; and Patricia Stretton gave me access to the Papers of Hugh Stretton at the National Library of Australia.

** The author was a member of George Rudé's third-year historiography class at Flinders University of South Australia in 1969. Versions of this paper were presented in Australia at the History Research Seminar, Flinders University, 21 March 2014; and to XIX George Rudé Seminar on French History and Civilisation, Deakin University, 11 July 2014.

Notes

- ¹ John Saville, in *George Rudé, 1910-1993, Marxist Historian: Memorial Tributes* (London: The Socialist History Society, Occasional Papers Series: no. 2 [1993]), 17 (hereafter abbreviated to *Memorial Tributes*).
- ² Eric Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life* (London: Allen Lane, 2002), 303.
- ³ Norman F. Cantor, ed., *Perspectives on the European Past: Conversations with Historians*, vol 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1971), 41.
- ⁴ George Rudé, "The Changing Face of the Crowd," in *The Historian's Workshop: Original Essays from Sixteen Historians*, ed. L.P. Curtis, Jr. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 189 – reprinted in Harvey J. Kaye, ed., *The Face of the Crowd: Studies in Revolution, Ideology and Popular Protest – Selected Essays of George Rudé* (New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf, 1988), 56-71. See also "Marxism and History" [1966], in Kaye, *The Face of the Crowd*, 43-55.

- ⁵ Rudé, “The Changing Face of the Crowd,” 190-91.
- ⁶ General discussions include Frederick Krantz, “‘Sans érudition, pas d’histoire’: The Work of George Rudé,” and Hugh Stretton, “George Rudé,” both in *History from Below: Studies in Popular Protest and Popular Ideology in Honour of George Rudé*, ed. Frederick Krantz (Montreal: Concordia University, 1985), 3-33, 43-54, respectively; Harvey J. Kaye, “Introduction: George Rudé, Social Historian,” in Kaye, *The Face of the Crowd*, 1-40; Gemma Betros, “Introduction,” in *French History and Civilization: Papers from the George Rudé Seminar*, ed. Gemma M. Betros, 3 (2009), 1-6 <http://www.h-france.net/rude/rudevolumeeiii/IntroductionVol3.pdf>.
- ⁷ A case in point is *Captain Swing* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1969), the book on the English agricultural labourers’ uprising of 1830, which he co-authored with Eric Hobsbawm. Although little critiqued for decades—apart from a critical review by G.E. Mingay in *English Historical Review* 883, no. 337 (1970), 810-14—it has come under intense scrutiny. See, for example, Carl J. Griffin, *The Rural War: Captain Swing and the Politics of Protest* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012); Steve Poole and Andrew Spicer, eds., “Captain Swing Reconsidered: Forty Years of Rural History From Below,” special issue of *Southern History* 32 (2010); Adrian Randall, “*Captain Swing*: A Retrospect,” *International Review of Social History* 54:3 (2009): 419-27; Peter Jones, “Swing, Speenhamland and Rural Social Relations: The ‘Moral Economy’ of the English Crowd in the Nineteenth Century,” *Social History* (2007): 32:3 (1997): 271-90; Roger Wells, “Mr William Cobbett, Captain Swing, and King William IV,” *Agricultural History Review* 45:1 (1997): 34-48; Andrew Charlesworth, *Social Protest in a Rural Society: The Spatial Distribution of the Captain Swing Disturbances of 1830-1831* (Norwich : Geo Abstracts for the Historical Geography Research Group, 1979). Earlier critiques of Rudé’s conceptualization of popular disturbances include Robert J. Holton, “The Crowd in History: Some Problems of Theory and Method,” *Social History* 3:2 (1978): 219-33; Mark Harrison, *Crowds and History: Mass Phenomena in English Towns, 1790-1835* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Andrew Charlesworth, “George Rudé and the Anatomy of the Crowd,” *Labour History Review* 5:3 (1990): 27-32.
- ⁸ James Friguglietti, “The Making of an Historian: the Parentage and Politics of George Rudé,” in *Revolution, Nation and Memory: Papers from the George Rudé Seminar in French History, Hobart, July 2002*, ed. Greg Burgess (Hobart: School of History and Classics, University of Tasmania, 2004), 24-25.
- ⁹ Bernard Crick, *George Orwell: A Life*, 2nd ed (London: Secker & Warburg, 1981), xxiv.
- ¹⁰ Hugh Stretton, “George Rudé,” 45; Tim Stretton, e-mail to author, 27 February 2014; Patricia Stretton, telephone interview, 11 March 2014.
- ¹¹ Eliot Rudie, telephone discussion with author, 13 April 2014.

- ¹² Rudé's antecedents and family background are recounted in James Friguglietti, "How George Frederick Elliot Rude became the Historian George Rudé," in *The Sphinx and the Tuileries and Other Essays in Modern French History*, ed. Robert Aldrich and Martin Lyons (Sydney: Department of Economic History, University of Sydney, 1999), 49-55.
- ¹³ These details are taken from Rudé's application for the post of senior lecturer, University of Adelaide, 20 December 1958, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ¹⁴ Stretton, "George Rudé," 43-44.
- ¹⁵ Saville, in *Memorial Tributes*, 17.
- ¹⁶ Nicholas Hiley, e-mail to author, 13 December 2013. Dr Hiley ascertained this information from David Low's collection of press cuttings at the British Cartoon Archive. Intourist advertised its conducted tours to the Soviet Union in the British press: eg. "Travel in Soviet Russia," *The Statesman and Nation* 14 May 1932. See also *Daily Worker* 21 June 1932; Kingsley Martin (text) and David Low (drawings), *Low's Russian Sketchbook* (London: Gollancz, 1932); David Low, *Low's Autobiography* (London: Michael Joseph, 1956), 223-32; C.H. Rolph, *Kingsley: The Life, Letters and Diaries of Kingsley Martin* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1973), 196.
- ¹⁷ Rudé's Communist Party résumé, 17 June 1952, Communist Party of Great Britain Archives, CP/Cent/Pers/6/05, Labour History Archive and Study Centre, Manchester. (Copy in Papers of Hugh Stretton, National Library of Australia, MS Acc09, 193, Box 7. Much of the material on Rudé in the Stretton Papers was sent to Stretton by James Friguglietti.)
- ¹⁸ John Bromley (University of Southampton) to Edgeloe, 24 September 1963, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 296-1963.
- ¹⁹ Harvey J. Kaye, "A Face in the Crowd," *Times Higher Education Supplement* 31 March 1989.
- ²⁰ "Nomination for Nation School" [1936] and Rudé's Communist Party résumé, 17 June 1952, both in Communist Party of Great Britain Archives; Rudé's Certificate of Service, National Fire Service (copies in Stretton Papers, Box 7).
- ²¹ Stretton, "George Rudé," 45.
- ²² James Friguglietti, "From Stalin to Robespierre: The Intellectual Development of George Rudé," in *Reflections at the End of the Century*, ed. Morris Slavin and Louis Patsouras (Youngstown, OH: Youngstown State University, 2002), 137-38.
- ²³ Quoted in Friguglietti, "The Making of an Historian," 19.
- ²⁴ High Master (R.L. James) [to whom it may concern,] 23 December 1948 (copy in Stretton Papers, Box 7).
- ²⁵ George Rudé, *The Crowd in the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 1. See also Rudé, "The Changing Face of the Crowd," 190.

- ²⁶ George Rudé, *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848* (New York: Wiley, 1964), 11-12.
- ²⁷ Rudé, "The Changing Face of the Crowd," 191.
- ²⁸ James Friguglietti, "A Scholar 'In Exile': George Rudé as a Historian of Australia," *French History and Civilisation*, ed. Betros, 8-9; <http://www.france.net/rude/2005conference/Friguglietti1.pdf> ; Friguglietti, e-mails to author, 14 May 2010, 25 February 2014.
- ²⁹ N.D. McLachlan, review (of *London and Paris in the Eighteenth Century*, by George Rudé), in *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 18:2 (1972): 305.
- ³⁰ Eric Hobsbawm, "The Historians' Group of the British Communist Party," in *Rebels and the Causes: Essays in Honour of A.L. Morton*, ed. Maurice Cornforth (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1978), 37.
- ³¹ Rudé, "The Changing Face of the Crowd," 191-94. Soboul was also a Marxist, a student of Lefebvre's and ultimately his successor as Professor of the French Revolution at the Sorbonne, the preeminent position in French history and held since the 1920s by a Marxist. Cobb, too, if not a Marxist, was at least Marxist, although his politics shifted during in the sixties. In the face of student radicalism, Cobb turned into a conservative. See also Richard Cobb, "The People in the French Revolution," *Past & Present* 15 (1959): 60-72; Cobb, "Georges Lefebvre," *Past & Present* 18 (1960): 52-65.
- ³² Eric Hobsbawm (interviewed by Pat Thane), in *Visions of History*, ed. Henry Abelove et al. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), 34. This may be true for historians but not necessarily for other disciplines. For example, Peter Worsley (1924-2013) was appointed to a lectureship in sociology at the University of Hull in 1954.
- ³³ Saville, in *Memorial Tributes*, 17.
- ³⁴ Saville, in *Memorial Tributes*, 17.
- ³⁵ Christopher Hill, in *Memorial Tributes*, 19
- ³⁶ Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 8.
- ³⁷ Hobsbawm, "The Historians' Group of the Communist Party," 24-25.
- ³⁸ Eric Hobsbawm, "George Rudé: Historian from Below," *Guardian* 12 January 1993.
- ³⁹ Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 8.
- ⁴⁰ James to Principal, Cheswick Polytechnic, 28 January 1953, and Principal to James, 30 January 1953, Stretton Papers, Box 7; Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁴¹ Hobsbawm and Saville, in *Memorial Tributes*, 8, 17, respectively.
- ⁴² Hobsbawm, "George Rudé: Historian from Below;" Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 8; Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.

- ⁴³ Alfred Cobban, *The Myth of the French Revolution* (London: H.K. Lewis for University College, London, 1955).
- ⁴⁴ Friguglietti, 'From Stalin to Robespierre,' 140-41. A photocopy of Rudé's endorsement of Stalin's rule, a 24-page pamphlet entitled *Why Russia is Strong: Four-Lesson Syllabus on Socialism in Practice* (London: Lawrence & Wishart for Marx Memorial Library and Workers' School, [1942]) is in the Stretton Papers, Box 7.
- ⁴⁵ Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 6.
- ⁴⁶ Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times*, 216; Bromley to Edgeloe, 24 September 1963, Rudé's staff file, University of Adelaide, 293-1963.
- ⁴⁷ Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 6.
- ⁴⁸ A copy of the will is in the Stretton Papers, Box 7.
- ⁴⁹ Stretton, "George Rudé," 45; Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 11.
- ⁵⁰ Stretton, 'George Rudé,' 45.
- ⁵¹ See James Friguglietti, *George Rudé (1910-1993): A Bibliography of his Political and Historical Writings*, 2nd ed (Billings: Montana State University—Billings, 2002).
- ⁵² Rudé, "The Changing Face of the Crowd," 191.
- ⁵³ George Rudé, "The Motives of Popular Insurrection in Paris during the French Revolution," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 26, no. 73 (1953): 53-74; Rudé, "Prices, Wages and Popular Movements in Paris during the French Revolution," *Economic History Review* Second Series, 6:3 (1954): 246-67; Rudé, "The Outbreak of the French Revolution," *Past & Present* 8 (1955): 28-42; Rudé, "The Gordon Riots: A Study of the Rioters and their Victims," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Fifth Series, 6 (1956): 93-114 (the Alexander Prize Essay.)
- ⁵⁴ George Rudé, [Application for the post of senior lecturer, University of Adelaide], 20 December 1958, University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁵⁵ Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁵⁶ Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁵⁷ W.R. Phillips to Director-General, Attorney-General's Department, 15 October 1958, Rudé's ASIO file, National Archives of Australia, Canberra, A6119, 2489 (page 3). Digital copy available at www.naa.gov.au. The open access version of Rudé's security file has been redacted (i.e. blacked out passages and missing pages) in order to protect the identities of agents and informants and to conceal any relationship with foreign agencies. There are 106 pages in the actual file but only 76 of these are available in the digital copy. References to page numbers pertain to the latter.

- ⁵⁸ University of Tasmania Council Minutes (vol 16), 24 April 1959, Tasmanian Archive & Heritage Office, AD940/1/16. See also notes from letter from Alan Ker Stout to J.M. Hinton, 2 June 1960 (transcript), and e-mail from Barrie Rose (professor of history, UTAS) to Peter McPhee, 2 February 2002, both in McPhee Papers, University of Melbourne Archives, 2009-0035, Box 13 (kindly forwarded by Peter McPhee.)
- ⁵⁹ Peter McPhee, *'Pansy': A Life of Roy Douglas Wright* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1999), 124-25.
- ⁶⁰ Peter Howell, telephone interview with author, 12 August 2013; e-mail, 21 April 2014. In 1959, as co-editor of the student newspaper, *Togatus*, Howell often provoked conservative academics and university councillors. He organized and hosted a student farewell to McManners at Hobart's Imperial Hotel in June 1960, but did not see him again until 1985, when they met at Oxford. It was then that McManners finally and fully acknowledged that the Tasmanian University Council's 1959 vetoing of Rudé's appointment had triggered his resignation. Howell's account is confirmed by Michael Roe (emeritus professor of history at UTAS), telephone interview with author, 28 November 2013.
- ⁶¹ J.B. Polya, "The Academic Turmoil in Tasmania," *Australian Quarterly* 34:1 (1962): 27-35.
- ⁶² Stretton, "George Rudé," 54; Stretton to Rose, 5 February 2002, Stretton Papers, Box 7.
- ⁶³ Hugh Stretton, interview by Susan Marsden, 4 & 8 October 2002, National Library of Australia, TRC 4895 (page 81 of typescript); Patricia Stretton, telephone interview with author, 11 March 2014. One of Rudé's referees stated that, "Schoolmastering really has prejudiced his [previous] Univ. applications. The prejudice is entirely beside the point." Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁶⁴ Edgeloe to Rudé, 23 April, 3 September 1959, and Rudé to Edgeloe, 2 May, 10 September 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁶⁵ Hugh Stretton, interview by Wilfrid Prest, 10 February 2005 (pages 1-2 of transcript). The actual interview was conducted in February; a transcript containing corrections from Stretton was finalized in July (courtesy of Wilfrid Prest).
- ⁶⁶ A few years later, for example, John M.R. Young was appointed to a lectureship at Adelaide after Stretton had solicited an opinion from Hill. Hill was also Wilfrid Prest's DPhil supervisor, which was a major reason why Prest went to Adelaide rather than returning to the University of Melbourne. Young, telephone interview with author, 29 September 2013; Prest, e-mail to author, 25 March 2014.
- ⁶⁷ Goodwin to Stretton, 14 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁶⁸ Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.

- ⁶⁹ J.S. Bromley and A. Goodwin (eds), *A Select List of Works on Europe and Europe Overseas, 1715-1815* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956).
- ⁷⁰ Tim Heald, ed., *My Dear Hugh: Letters from Richard Cobb to Hugh Trevor-Roper and others* (London: Francis Lincoln, 2011), 19 (letter from Cobb to Bromley, 7 February 1957.)
- ⁷¹ McManners to Edgeloe, 17 September 1963, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 392-1963; John McManners and John Roberts, "John Bromley, Historian," in *Corsairs and Navies, 1660-1760*, ed. J.S. Bromley, (London/Ronceverte, WV: Hambledon Press, 1987), xv-xxi; Nigel Aston, "Jack McManners, 1916-2006," *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy* 12 (2013): 281, 284.
- ⁷² Goodwin to Stretton, 14 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁷³ Bromley to Stretton, 18 January 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁷⁴ Michael Roe, telephone interview with author, 28 November 2013.
- ⁷⁵ Hugh Stretton, "Brenner and the University of Adelaide," *Vestes: Journal of the Federal Council of University Staff Associations of Australia* 4:4 (1961): 6-7.
- ⁷⁶ Hugh Stretton to Editor of *The Advertiser* (Adelaide), unpublished, [March 1993], Stretton's staff file, University of Adelaide Archives, 595-1953. See also Stretton, interview by Susan Marsden (pages 78-80 of typescript); Stretton, interview by Wilfrid Prest (page 5 of typescript); Stretton, "George Rudé," 45.
- ⁷⁷ P.A. Howell, "Sir Thomas John Mellis Napier (1882-1976)," *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, vol. 15 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2000), 463 (quotation), <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/napier-sir-thomas-john-mellis-11220/text20005>, accessed online 22 April 2014.
- ⁷⁸ J.F. Foster (Secretary, Association to Universities for the British Commonwealth) to Edgeloe, 2 July 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁷⁹ M.W. Brown (Holloway School) [to whom it may concern], 18 February 1958; Brown to Edgeloe, 26 June 1959 (quotation); R.L. James (ex-St Paul's School) to Edgeloe, 29 June 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁸⁰ Rudé to Edgeloe, 10 September 1959, Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 207-1959.
- ⁸¹ E.L. W[heelwright], "Political Tests for University Appointments: The Russel Ward Case," *Vestes* 4:1 (1961): 51-67.
- ⁸² Robert Scoble, "The Knopfelmacher Case," *Quadrant* 15:5 (1971): 72-82.
- ⁸³ "Entry into Australia – Mr Y.S. Brenner," National Archives of Australia, Canberra, A1838, 1453/4318 (digital copy available at www.naa.gov.au); Stretton, "Brenner and the University of Adelaide," 5-12.
- ⁸⁴ Telegram, 22 December 1959; D.V. O'Leary to Director-General, 27 January 1960 (quotation), Rudé's ASIO file (pages 12 and 19 respectively.)

- ⁸⁵ K.S. Inglis, “Hugh Stretton’s University of Adelaide, 1954-56,” *Journal of the Historical Society of South Australia* 18 (1990): 11.
- ⁸⁶ Regional Director S[outh] A[ustralia], Attorney-General’s Department to ASIO Headquarters, Melbourne, 5 January 1960, Rudé’s ASIO file (page 13.)
- ⁸⁷ Referred to by Regional Director, SA to ASIO Headquarters, 19 January 1967, Rudé’s ASIO file (page 46.)
- ⁸⁸ Stretton to Rose, 5 February 2002, Stretton Papers, Box 7.
- ⁸⁹ Regional Director, SA, Attorney-General’s Department to ASIO Headquarters, 24 August 1960, Rudé’s ASIO file (page 19.)
- ⁹⁰ Statement re Marjorie Pollitt, May/June 1967, Rudé’s ASIO file (page 63.) A common refrain in a recent collection of essays by people who were spied on by ASIO concerns the frequency of misinformation about themselves and others in their files. Meredith Bergmann, ed., *Dirty Secrets: Our ASIO Files* (Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2014).
- ⁹¹ Stretton, “George Rudé,” 44.
- ⁹² Harvey J. Kaye, in *Memorial Tributes*, 12. Kaye made amends with “Introduction: George Rudé, Social Historian,”—republished as “George Rudé: All History Must Be Studied Afresh,” in *The Education of Desire: Marxists and the Writing of History*, ed. Harvey J. Kaye, (New York: Routledge, 1992), 31-64.
- ⁹³ Wilfrid Prest, “How We Got Here From There: History in a ‘Scottish University,’” in *Pasts Present: History at Australia’s Third University*, ed. Wilfrid Prest (Adelaide: Wakefield Press, 2014), 18.
- ⁹⁴ Wilfrid Prest, discussion with author, 17 March 2014. Unless otherwise stated, the face-to-face interviews and discussions were conducted in Adelaide.
- ⁹⁵ Stretton, “George Rudé,” 46.
- ⁹⁶ Alan H. Adamson, “George Rudé in Canada,” in *History from Below*, ed. Krantz, 57; Stretton, “George Rudé,” 46; Elliot Rudie, telephone discussion with author, 13 April 2014
- ⁹⁷ Brian Dickey, discussion with author, 21 March 2014.
- ⁹⁸ Tim Stretton, e-mail to author, 21 September 2013 (Tim Stretton is now a professor of history at St Mary’s University, Nova Scotia.)
- ⁹⁹ Stretton to Edgeloe, 5 September 1963, Rudé’s University of Adelaide staff file, 392-1963. Completed and awaiting publication were *Revolutionary Europe, 1783-1815* (London: Collins, 1964), and a collection of documents, *The Eighteenth Century* (New York: Free Press, 1965).
- ¹⁰⁰ W.K. Hancock to Edgeloe, 20 November 1963, Rudé’s University of Adelaide staff file, 392-1963.
- ¹⁰¹ *Advertiser* (Adelaide), 2 September 1964; ASIO Adelaide to ASIO Headquarters, 13 October 1965, both in Rudé’s ASIO file (pages 30 and 31, respectively.)
- ¹⁰² Stretton to Rose, 5 February 2002, Stretton Papers, Box 7; Patricia Stretton, e-mail to author, 25 March 2014.

- ¹⁰³ Wilfrid Prest, "History," in *A History of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Adelaide, 1876-2012*, ed. Nick Harvey et al. (Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press, 2012), 252 & n (quotation); Trevor Wilson (emeritus professor of history, University of Adelaide), interview with author, 5 September 2013.
- ¹⁰⁴ Minutes of the Academic Planning Board, 2 December 1966, University of Stirling Archives.
- ¹⁰⁵ Information from Jean Suggett; Judith Adamson, telephone interview with author, 17 October 2013; Richard J. Evans, e-mail to author, 8 July 2014.
- ¹⁰⁶ Doreen was asked at a farewell party in late-1970 about the "secret" of their marriage. She replied (half-jokingly?) that George's writing routines meant that they never had breakfast together.
- ¹⁰⁷ George Rudé, interview with Averil Holt, 2 May 1985, Flinders University Archives, TSF1059 S376/10 (page 1 of typescript). Another copy is held in the Oral History Collection of the Archives of the State Library of South Australia.
- ¹⁰⁸ Minutes of the History Staff Meetings, 25 March 1968, Flinders University Archives, TSF1071 S240.
- ¹⁰⁹ John McCracken, e-mail to Karl Magee, 12 September 2013. I am indebted to Karl Magee (the Stirling University Archivist) for making enquiries on my behalf. McCracken, an Africanist, arrived at Stirling University shortly after Rudé's departure and was surprised to find him no longer there.
- ¹¹⁰ Robert McKean, telephone interview with author, 4 July 2013. McKean spent 39 years at Stirling, retiring as professor of modern Russian history in 2007: "The two historians who most influenced me as a novice postgraduate student and steered me into my choice of research field of the social and working class history of late Imperial Russia were E.P. Thompson (*The Making of the English Working Class*) and George Rudé. By appointing me to Stirling and by his intellectual influence George set the pattern of my academic life, for which I remain eternally grateful." McKean, e-mail to author, 26 March 2014.
- ¹¹¹ John Morrill, e-mail to author, 14 April 2014. Morrill is now Professor of British and Irish History at Cambridge University.
- ¹¹² Eric Richards, discussion with author, 2 July 2013 (Wellington, NZ); Robert McKean, e-mail to author, 21 September 2013; Richard J. Evans, e-mail to author, 8 July 2014. Evans is now Regius Professor of History at Cambridge University.
- ¹¹³ Judith Adamson, e-mail to author, 21 October 2013.
- ¹¹⁴ Judith Adamson, e-mail to author, 6 November 2013 (as told to Judith Adamson by John Hill, who was the chair of history when Rudé arrived at SGWU in late-1970.) The Concordia University Archives purchased five boxes of Rudé Papers from a bookshop in Hastings (UK) in 2006. This material is not as yet organized and described. An archivist/records officer at Concordia surveyed the boxes' contents on my behalf. They contain mostly research material and manuscripts. The

cursory search uncovered no information about Rudé's appointment at Concordia. Vincent Ouellette, e-mail to author, 10 July 2013.

- ¹¹⁵ Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (page 7 of typescript).
- ¹¹⁶ P.H. Karmel (Vice-Chancellor), "Flinders University Notes and News," 18 October 1969, copy in Minutes of History Staff Meetings, Flinders University Archive, TSF1071 S240. Rudé's successor at Flinders is incorrect in stating that "Professor G.F.E. Rudé seemed no sooner to arrive than to announce that he was not staying." R.J. Moore, "Ten Years of History at Flinders," *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* no. 3 of 1976 (September): 6.
- ¹¹⁷ Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (page 1 of typescript).
- ¹¹⁸ David Hilliard, interview with author, 16 May 2013; Brian Dickey, discussion with author, 21 March 2014. Hilliard and Dickey spent their entire teaching careers at Flinders University.
- ¹¹⁹ Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (page 3 of typescript); K.J. Hancock, interview with author, 16 August 2013.
- ¹²⁰ David Hilliard, interview with author, 16 May 2013; Brian Dickey, discussions with author, 16 September 2013, 21 March 2014.
- ¹²¹ David Hilliard, *Flinders University: The First 25 Years, 1966-1991* (Adelaide: Flinders University of South Australia, 1991), 15-16, 31.
- ¹²² Doug Munro, "Oliver MacDonagh at Flinders University, 1964-1968," *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 86 (1997): 45-58.
- ¹²³ Minutes of History Staff Meetings, 25 March 1968, Flinders University Archives, TSF1071 S240.
- ¹²⁴ Ken Inglis, interview with author, 12 July 2014 (Melbourne). Inglis co-taught the course with Rudé in 1960.
- ¹²⁵ George Rudé, "For Historians Meeting on 9/4/1969," dated 2 April 1969, and Minutes of History Staff Meetings, 9 April 1968, both in Flinders University Archives, TSF1071 S240. See also Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (pages 3 and 6 of typescript).
- ¹²⁶ These details are taken from the Flinders University *Calendars, 1968-72*. John Morrill, who taught at the Stirling history department in 1974, remarks on the similarities in Rudé's emphasis on the study of revolutions at both places. Morrill, e-mail to author, 14 April 2014. Michael Rapport, who arrived at Stirling in 1995, recalls the survival to that point of Rudé's "vision of a curriculum which began with the eighteenth-century revolutions and followed on from there." Peter McPhee, e-mail to author, 12 September 2014 (as told to Peter McPhee by Michael Rapport, who is now reader in history at the University of Glasgow).
- ¹²⁷ James Cotton, e-mail to author, 21 September 2013. Cotton won the University Medal in Social Sciences at Flinders in 1970 and was in Rudé's historiography class the year before. He recently retired as professor of politics at the Australian Defence Force Academy, Canberra.

- ¹²⁸ Cotton, e-mail to author, 6 April 2014.
- ¹²⁹ David Hilliard, e-mail to author, 31 October 2013 (as told to David Hilliard by Peter Howell.)
- ¹³⁰ Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (page 3 of typescript).
- ¹³¹ Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (page 3 of typescript).
- ¹³² Minutes of the Interim Staff/Student Negotiating Committee, 6 October 1969, in Minutes of the History Consultative Committee, Flinders University Archives, TSF1071 S142/6.
- ¹³³ David Hilliard, interview with author, 16 May 2013, and discussion with author, 21 March 2014.
- ¹³⁴ Saville, in *Memorial Tributes*, 16.
- ¹³⁵ Hilliard, *Flinders University*, 57-68.
- ¹³⁶ Wilfrid Prest, discussion with author, 17 March 2014.
- ¹³⁷ The notification is in *The Flinders University of South Australia Newsletter*, 1:3 (August 1969), 2. The lecture, under the same title, has been republished in Kaye, *The Face of the Crowd*, 72-79.
- ¹³⁸ Peter McPhee, discussion with author at the Australasian Association for European History Conference, Wellington, 4 July 2013. McPhee was a professor of history and later the provost at the University of Melbourne.
- ¹³⁹ John G. Reid, e-mails to author, 6 March, 10 March 2014. Reid is a professor of history at St Mary's University, Nova Scotia.
- ¹⁴⁰ Kaye, in *Memorial Tributes*, 13.
- ¹⁴¹ Victor Bailey, e-mail to author, 24 June 2014. Bailey is the Charles W. Battey Distinguished Professor of Modern British History at the University of Kansas. See also E.P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past & Present* 50 (1971): 76-136; Roger Wells, "E.P. Thompson, *Customs in Common*, and Moral Economy," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 21:2 (1994): 263-307.
- ¹⁴² Alan Williams, e-mail to author, 13 September 2014. Williams is a professor of history at Wake Forest University, North Carolina.
- ¹⁴³ Rudé, interview with Averil Holt (page 7 of typescript).
- ¹⁴⁴ <http://h-france.net/rude/rudeindex.html>
- ¹⁴⁵ David Philips, review (of *Protest and Punishment: The Story of Social and Political Protesters Transported to Australia, 1788-1868*), in *English Historical Review* 95, no. 375 (1980): 375-77; Friguglietti, "A Scholar 'In Exile,'" 7-8. Patricia O'Brien, "Crime and Punishment as Historical Problem," *Journal of Social History* 11:4 (1978): 511-12. Rudé's later book, *Criminal and Victim: Crime and Society in Early Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), is also due for reassessment.
- ¹⁴⁶ Geoff Eley, "Working-Class Agency: Past and Present," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class in History of the Americas* 10:3 (2013): 36 & n.4. See also Eley,

- The Crooked Line: From Cultural History to the History of Society* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), 13-14.
- ¹⁴⁷ Robert Dare, e-mail to author, 25 March 2014. See Gordon S. Wood, "A Note on Mobs in the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly* 23:4 (1966): 635-42; Pauline Maier, "Popular Uprisings and Civil Authority in Eighteenth-Century America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 27:1 (1970): 3-35.
- ¹⁴⁸ Stuart Macintyre, e-mail to author, 26 March 2014. Macintyre's books include *A Proletarian Science: Marxism in Britain, 1917-1933* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- ¹⁴⁹ Bill Murray, discussion with author, 30 October 2014.
- ¹⁵⁰ Robert Dare (Chairman, Department of History, University of Adelaide) to Australian High Commissioner, London, 5 June 1985, and Dare to University of Adelaide Registrar, 10 July 1985, both in Rudé's University of Adelaide staff file, 392-1963; Dare, e-mail to author, 5 March 2014; information from Jean Suggett.
- ¹⁵¹ Bill Murray, discussion with author, 30 October 2014.
- ¹⁵² McPhee, discussions with author, 4 July 2013 (Wellington) and 11 July 2014 (Geelong, Australia); Susan Foley, discussion with author, 12 July 2014 (Geelong). Bill Murray, e-mail to author, 30 October 2014. McPhee and Murray's testimonies differ at certain points.
- ¹⁵³ Hobsbawm, in *Memorial Tributes*, 6.
- ¹⁵⁴ Information from Jean Suggett.
- ¹⁵⁵ Kaye, *The Face of the Crowd*; Kaye, in *Memorial Tributes*, 13.
- ¹⁵⁶ George Rudé, *The French Revolution* (London/New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1988).
- ¹⁵⁷ John Styles, "George Rudé," in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Historians*, ed. John Cannon et al. (New York: Blackwell Reference, 1988), 361.
- ¹⁵⁸ James Friguglietti, "Dispersing the Crowd: The Changing Reputation of George Rudé as a Historian of the French Revolution," *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History, 2000*, vol. 28 (Las Cruces: New Mexico State University, 2002), 301-09. The only time Rudé responded to critics was probably at a publisher's insistence, when he and Hobsbawm discussed the reception of *Captain Swing*. Hobsbawm and Rudé, "Introduction to Penguin Edition," in *Captain Swing* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), xi-xvi.
- ¹⁵⁹ Gerald J. Cavanaugh, "The Present State of French Revolutionary Historiography: Alfred Cobban and Beyond," *French Historical Studies* 7:4 (1972): 354 (quotation); Geoffrey Ellis, "The 'Marxist Interpretation' of the French Revolution," *English Historical Review* 93, no. 367 (1978), 360.
- ¹⁶⁰ Alfred Cobban, *The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 122-23, 126-27. See also Jeremy D. Popkin, *A Short History of the French Revolution*, 5th ed (Boston: Prentice Hall, 2010), 138-43; Lawrence Harvard Davis, "Georges Lefebvre (1874-1959)," in *French*

Historians, 1900-2000, ed. Philip Daileader and Philip Whalen (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 417-27.

- ¹⁶¹ Cavanaugh, "The Present State of French Revolutionary Historiography," 602 n.65; Richard Cobb, "Overcrowding" (review of *The Crowd in History and Revolutionary Europe*), in *Times Literary Supplement*, 30 December 1965.
- ¹⁶² Greg Dening, "On the Cultural History of Marshall Sahlins and Valerio Valeri", *Pacific History Bibliography and Comment* (1988): 45.
- ¹⁶³ W.K. Hancock, *Country and Calling* (London: Faber & Faber, 1954), 76.