“A Repository, a Switchboard, a Dynamo”: H.L. Beales, a Historian in a Mass Media Age
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i. ‘The Youth of Industrialism’

In March and April 1930, a series of radio debates were broadcast on the BBC entitled ‘The Youth of Industrialism’. These talks discussed the ways in which Britain had changed since the Industrial Revolution. The talks responded to the prominent historiographical debates on the costs and benefits Industrial Revolution of the late 1920s, between J.L. and Barbara Hammond and J.H. Clapham. Each week, the two presenters took opposing lines on a particular issue:

[Lambert]: Industrialism had increased the amount of free-will, the amount of imagination and desire for progress in society.
[Beales]: My case against Industrialism is that it lowers the quality of life which is available for the people as a whole.

Listeners were encouraged to respond to the broadcasts in wireless discussion groups, and write in voicing their opinions on the matter. After the first broadcast, 219 voted in favour of industrialism and 70 against. In each of the subsequent debates Beales and Lambert took opposing views on matters, such as protectionism, government intervention, and the idea of progress, taking the subject from its inception at the Industrial Revolution up to the present day.

This paper is not an intellectual reconstruction of Beales: a historian who produced no great work, and whose impact on academic debates – aside from a paper arguing that the great agricultural depression of the late nineteenth century was a myth – was negligible. Though Beales found little in the way of honour as a historian, in the conventional academic sense of publication and preferment, his numerous interventions into peripheral areas of what might today be termed ‘popular history’ – the BBC, mass market paperback publishing, work as a leading figure within the adult education movement, and his immense influence as a teacher and supervisor – meant that he was one of the most significant, even influential, nineteenth-century historians of the mid twentieth century.

The career of H.L. Beales demonstrates the different ways in which historical knowledge diffused to a wider audience in the age of broadcast media and mass education. This overview refutes standard historiographical approaches which focus on ideas and control of academic networks of prestige as the primary means in which the British historical profession worked. Beales, who was congenitally averse to the labours of research, writing and departmental politics (staples of any academic career), was nonetheless a key proponent of the ‘Engaged Tradition’ of adult education, which sought to bring socially-committed education to the millions. Beales was instrumental in establishing the discipline of social
history as a subject with an importance that stretched far beyond the university. For Beales, as for many others during this period, studying the history of the Industrial Revolution was vitally necessary for understanding the nature of contemporary society.

ii. Biographical Sketch up to 1945

Hugh Lancelot Beales was born in 1889 in Sedbergh, North Yorkshire. He attended the Kingswood School in Bath where he lost the Wesleyan faith of his father, a Methodist minister and an unsuccessful Liberal candidate in the 1905 General Election. Beales retained much of the dissenting spirit, infused with a caustic irony, that both commended or infuriated him to colleagues. Much of the later friction between Beales and R.H. Tawney would come from Beales’ avowed, even belligerent, secularism. Beales suggested that it was Tawney’s deep dislike that ultimately cost him the chair in economic history at LSE. Beales initially studied medieval history at Manchester under the renowned historian T.F. Tout. He served in the First World War, refusing a commission. It was only after the war, coming to Sheffield University in 1919, that he came to study the Industrial Revolution. His role there was specifically created to teach mature returning soldiers and to teach extramural classes to steelworkers in the area and it was from this that he gained his lifelong commitment to adult education. Beales joined LSE in 1926, at a time when the school boasted such luminaries as Tawney, Eileen Power, L.T. Hobhouse, T.H. Marshall, Bronislaw Malinowski, and Morris Ginsberg. Beales warmed to the intellectually convivial atmosphere of the School, ‘where there was no kind of barrier between humble lecturers like myself…There was a free exchange of views and nobody cared whether you were orthodox…You lectured as you like.’ Beales possessed an anti-authoritarian streak which opposed both disciplinary specialization and academic hierarchy. In an era when the British historical profession was still in its infancy, Beales welcomed porous disciplinary boundaries between historians, economic historians, and sociologists who all studied the effects of the Industrial Revolution. Beales was just as much at home with the famous LSE ‘women historians’, including Lilian Knowles (whose lecture style he described alternately as ‘controversial’, ‘picturesque’ and ‘brilliant’), Dorothy Marshall, and Eileen Power (whose grace and good nature managed to reconcile the social and economic history factions within the department), as he was with eminent Edwardian moralists turned academic sociologists.

1926 was also the year that the Economic History Society was founded. The society, as initially conceived by W.J. Ashley and E.E. Lipson, was a broad-based organization which
counted many schoolteachers and extramural tutors among its membership and which strongly attempted to reconcile economic history and theory with the social context that many, such as Beales, believed was essential to understanding economic change.\textsuperscript{13} However, the society failed as a general non-academic organization, with membership far below that predicted.\textsuperscript{14} The historiographical shift of the late 1920s, most fully-represented by Clapham’s criticisms of the Hammonds in his accomplished \textit{Economic History of England} (1926-39), led to economic history being defined as a subject based on empirical rigour over any idealistic or emotive claims. It became increasingly independent from the form of social history practised by the previous generation from Arnold Toynbee and William Cunningham to Tawney and the Hammonds.\textsuperscript{15}

Beales fell between two interpretations of history at a moment in which economic and social history were rapidly bifurcating. Beales taught at the LSE Economic History department which, despite the Schools’ wider turn towards systematic economics during the 1930s under Beveridge, Robbins, and Hayek\textsuperscript{16}, was still committed to social history as the primary means of understanding economic change. He was, like Laski, Ginsberg, and Tawney, a committed member of the Labour Party, believing that the school should contribute to forming the party’s policies.\textsuperscript{17} The pre-war history department was indebted to sociology: sharing both lecturers and students with the department. His great friends, Harold Laski and T.H. Marshall, also taught history lectures. Sidney Webb was an occasional attendee of Beales’ weekly seminars.\textsuperscript{18}

Beales’ lectures were famously wide-ranging and averse to economic ‘facts’. The economist and educational reformer Bernard Corry remembered a petition against Beales after a lecture from economists demanding more rigour: ‘I remember he came in the next week and said, “I gather the economists want facts.” And for an hour he read out statistics and then he said, “That is the last bloody fact you are getting.”’\textsuperscript{19} In Beales’ own words:

\begin{quote}
I began to realise the…unrealities of that specialisation. Therefore one of my main aims was to make the basis of historical thinking not economic but social…Turning, deliberately trying to establish the roots of all historical thinking in the social not the economic field, why should we accept a particular doctrine of economic thinking as having a validity over any other doctrine of economic thinking. I didn’t feel in any sense embarrassed by the determination to take economic history into the social…The economists sort of regarded themselves as having the key to the universe, and they hadn’t. It was one reading among many, but nobody accepted that view. I did; I set my face against it, and I suppose that was one of the reasons why I tried to establish a social instead of an economic context for the developments that took place.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

Despite these reservations, Beales produced a number of significant articles for \textit{Economic History Review} and elsewhere on the subject of ‘Historical Revisions’.\textsuperscript{21} However,
he produced no academic monograph. A month before her death in 1940, Eileen Power wrote
to Beales: ‘I simply can’t carry on the [Economic History] review without some collaboration
from economic historians…if scholarship is at all worth keeping up in war time I do feel you
owe us a contribution.’ When applying for Power’s vacant chair in 1944, Beales’ tried to
downplay his lack of publications, noting: ‘I published nothing during this period. I did not
feel ready to write.’ His letter instead provided an outline of the two books he intended to
write: one on the intellectual and social background of the Industrial Revolution, and the
second on social policy from the early Victorians to the present. Unlike the Hammonds, the
Webbs, G.D.H. Cole and Raymond Postgate, or even Peter and Majorie Quennell (who all
wrote popular social history books during this period), Beales, for various reasons, could not
write at any length. Beales was an economic historian by association and by subject, required
to participate in an increasingly-specialized academic community that had grown up during
his time at LSE. However, his preferences as a historian lay in teaching the history of the
Industrial Revolution and nineteenth century social history to as broad an audience as
possible in an undogmatic manner.

iii. Adult Educator

The two short books Beales produced, The Industrial Revolution (1928) and Early English
Socialists (1933), were introductory excursions rather than original work. They reflected his
belief in presenting a balanced view of the subjects covered. Both books were written
primarily for the Workers’ Educational Association (WEA). Beales’ articles in its journal,
Highway, were synoptic attempts to balance opposing viewpoints in academic literature, to
make them accessible to adult students, and to suggest a more consensual approach to
teaching the Industrial Revolution than existed in academic circles. In one article, he noted:
‘It is easy to suggest that something in all these analyses is true. One must add that none
contains all the truth. No very modern history can ever, in view of the overwhelming masses
of material and the virtual impossibility of objective social history, be entirely satisfactory.’
The Industrial Revolution, which Beales’ obituarist in the Times claimed was as
influential on the adult education movement as Tawney’s Equality and Acquisitive Society,
stressed that the Industrial Revolution could be taught in any number of different ways. The
tutor did not necessarily need to preach the gospel of socialism or the evolution of the labour
movement to appeal to a working class audience but rather acquaint them with how the
system of contemporary industrial capitalism had developed over the previous hundred and
fifty years. Once acquainted with this, they could make up their own minds and decide for
themselves what was to be done. For Beales, the period could not be taught by economic fact alone but through a wide range of subjective experiences of industrialism, the perceived quality of life for contemporary workers (whether or not overall prices were rising or falling), and their responses to social and economic change. Returning to produce a revised edition thirty years after the original, Beales felt he was only required to preface the book with a short historiographical essay on recent scholarship, and a quote from *Tristram Shandy* highlighting the uncertain nature of the subject: ‘The reader will be content to wait for a full explanation of these matters till the next year – when a series of things will be laid open which he little expects.’

If Beales was equivocal when it came to historical judgment, this did not impair his obvious qualities as a class tutor. John Allaway, who attended adult education classes in social history and local government given by Beales at Sheffield, was drawn to the subject by Beales’ skills as a lecturer:

> Beales is a first-rate teacher…who can share easily and with all kinds of men his great wealth of knowledge…His humanity and urbanity, as well as his scholarship, captured my heart at once. As well as an eager listener to his lectures and an active participant in class discussion, I became an avid reader of the books he recommended and an industrious essay writer. The years I spent under him were an inspiration.

With Beales’ support, Allaway gained a place to study economics at Sheffield University. He went on to become Professor of Education and Warden at Vaughan College, Leicester.

On moving to London, Beales continued to work as a tutor and organizer. LSE at this time taught many adult students at evening classes, which Beales took alongside a number of extramural classes for the WEA. Beales refused to see any difference in either the subject or level that he taught, replicating the content of his wide-ranging discourses for both undergraduates and adult education students. Beales later confessed that he believed the latter were better suited to the message than those who had had no contact with the world. He was a key member of the British Institute of Adult Education (BIAE) which published *Highway*. It was through work at this institution that he was to meet W.E. Williams, who later worked with him as editor of Pelican Books. Beales was one of the many tutors and organizers of adult education that the movement depended. His skills as a popular broadcast historian stemmed from his years of experience teaching students who demanded interesting, engaging, and accessible classes.

Beales’ conception of the Industrial Revolution as a foundational subject for the movement, which must necessarily avoid the partisan controversy it so often attracted, reflected the wider educational aims of the movement as a whole. Through his teaching, his
articles, and his introduction to the subject, he indelibly shaped the teaching of the subject in
the movement for decades, bringing to it his characteristic openness and breadth of
understanding. In 1963, in a survey of adult education tutors at the University of Manchester.
One question asked them why they had entered the profession. Alongside a desire to teach
adults, commitments to various social philosophies, and a broad desire to carry out
meaningful social work, Beales was personally listed as a reason for becoming an adult
education tutor.31

iv. Broadcast Historian: Beales at the BBC
Beales’ work at LSE and the BIAE drew him into the early years of radio broadcasting.
Remarking on his first broadcast talk, on the state of roads during the eighteenth century, he
noted putting something together drawn from the Webbs’ *Story of the King’s Highway* (1913)
and Daniel Defore’s *Tour Thro’ the Whole of Great Britain* (1724-7): ‘it seemed to suit them
because they asked me to go again from time to time.’32 Radio broadcasting paid the princely
sum of £1 per minute on air, with half again if the talk was republished in the *Listener*
magazine: at a time when Beales earned less than £500 per year as a lecturer, rising to £550
when he became a Reader in 1931. Aside from the innovatory talks on ‘The Youth of
Industrialism’, Beales spoke on a variety of subjects covering both historical and
contemporary social problems. He reviewed, among other things, John Strachey’s *Theory and
Practise of Socialism* (1936) and George Orwell’s *Road to Wigan Pier* (1937), which he
applauded for eschewing Marxist and economistic interpretations of class-struggle. Beales
declared that ‘Mr Orwell’s subject is the human and cultural rather than the material results
of industrialism.’33 Beales broadcast several talks in the BBCs Victorian Season, published as
*Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians* (1949), in which he spoke on ‘The Victorian Idea of Sex’,
mischievously perpetuating the myth about Victorians covering table legs.34

Beales’ most important contact within the BBC was R.S. Lambert, head of the BBCs
adult service from 1926 and founding editor of *Listener* magazine from 1928-39.35 Beales
met Lambert when the two were WEA tutors in Sheffield in the early 1920s and both
maintained a close relationship based on their appreciation of social history as the foundation
to contemporary social study. Beside the ‘Youth of Industrialism’ broadcasts, the two
 collaborated on an important collection, *Memoirs of the Unemployed* (1934), which collected
the voices of the angry, dispirited and dispossessed of the Great Depression. The book
combined the social mission of adult education, the analytical sociological research of LSE,
with the social reportage of the BBC (the memoirs were originally collected for *Listener*).36
Crucially, the volume sought to shift focus on unemployment from the quantitative to the qualitative, and to bring home to readers that these people had something to contribute to society: ‘These unemployed men and women are decent people. We are losing their help in building up our common life. They, like ourselves, have it in them to add their quota to the common stock. Are we bound to make them fruitless aliens in their own country?’

With Lambert, who was a governor of the British Film Institution, Beales produced the educational film, *A Medieval Village* (1935), designed as an aid to adult education classes. The film continued the idea of the links between the past and present by looking at the Nottinghamshire village of Laxton, the only place in the country to have continued with the Open Fields system. The agriculturalist and historian, C.S. Orwin, once remarked to Beales that the film was the impetus of his book *The Open Fields* (1938), which devoted a large part of the book to a study of Laxton.

Beales’ extensive work with the BBC throughout the 1920s and 1930s was a crucial part of his notion that history should reach the broadest possible audience without diluting its content. In this, he lived up to the ideas of the Reithian Spirit that broadcasting ought to educate first and entertain second, combined with the socially-committed ideals that lay behind the adult education movement.

v. ‘Chief Academic Pilot’: Pelican Books

The audiences that Beales and others sought to reach were the intellectual elite of the working and middle classes, generally deprived of higher education. They were precisely those people to whom Allen Lane aimed Penguin Books at. Though Lane was an astute businessman before mass educator, he decided in 1937 to launch the non-fiction imprint, Pelican books. Lane appointed V. Krishna Menon as general editor, with Beales subsequently brought onto the editorial board along with W.E. Williams and the Marxist scientist Lancelot Hogben. Williams was an important figure in the London WEA. As Secretary of the BIAE from 1934-40 and was thus a natural ally of Beales.

Beales had a knack for predicting which books had the potential of selling in editions of sixty to eighty thousand plus. His longstanding links with adult education and interest in the earlier history of nineteenth century educational publishing gave him a crucial insight into potential bestsellers. His selection of Freud’s *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, despite Allen Lane’s scepticism, sold out an edition of 70 000 within a week. In the imprint’s early years Beales was instrumental in publishing the work of many of his LSE colleagues, including Harold Laski’s *Liberty in the Modern State*, Eileen Power’s *Medieval People*, R.H.
Tawney’s *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, and Beatrice Webb’s *My Apprenticeship*. Along with the Hammonds’ biography of *Lord Shaftesbury*, Beales also published, in six volumes Elie Halévy’s *History of the English People since 1815*.\(^45\) Halévy’s book was an interesting choice: an account of the Industrial Revolution published by an avowedly liberal French historian, who saw England’s industrial development and religious non-conformism as key to its political stability.\(^46\) The structure of the work was key to Beales’ conception of the period: with separate volumes giving a cumulative political, economic, social, cultural, and religious account of the nineteenth century which together created an integrated account of an intense period of change which denied an single overarching causal explanation. For Beales, Pelican books was primarily an educational tool: ‘the basic idea in my mind was to give people good books in every kind of subject regardless of what the trend of them might be’.\(^47\) Pelican books was a further area in which Beales did much to promote the work of others at the expense of his own.\(^48\)

Whilst Beales was, in Richard Hoggart’s words, Pelican’s ‘chief academic pilot’,\(^49\) he and Williams were increasingly at odds, if not so much at the direction the imprint was heading then with one another personally. If anything, their personalities were too similar. Looking back, Beales declared Williams a ‘liar and a thief’\(^50\) for ultimately displacing the other editors and claiming Pelican as his idea. Whatever politicking Williams was guilty of, it was also clear that Beales was a difficult person to work with for prolonged periods. The publisher George Weidenfield, who later worked with Beales on establishing *Contact Books*, remembered Beales as a ‘Falstaffian Fabian Socialist’: ‘Wistfully cynical and always very relaxed, Beales struck me as a rather lazy man. He could be discursive and long-winded when I was burning with impatience to get on, but he was full of ideas and proved a useful ally.’\(^51\)

Beales and Williams wrote distinctly uncomplimentary portraits of one another in the 1940 edition of *Penguin’s Progress*, in which Williams affectionately noted his colleagues’ indolence: ‘Beales likes to relax. His favourite posture is a semi-horizontal one’.\(^52\) Whilst praising Beales’ capabilities as a lecturer, a listener, and a drinker – ‘On liquorish occasions he can absorb so much that I have sometimes imagined his inside must resemble the deltas of the Nile or the Mississippi’\(^53\) – Williams’ account highlighted clear tensions between two very similar minds, equally committed to the idea of popular mass market education. Though Beales’ name remained on each Pelican book until 1945 (Menon and Hogben’s were removed in 1939), he was, at best, an ad hoc advisor, with Williams (Allen Lane’s Chief Advisor) firmly in charge.\(^54\)
vi. The LSE: Between Sociology and Economic History

Williams had captured something of the tensions within Beales’ gadfly personality, describing him as: ‘a repository, a switchboard, a dynamo, and Lord only knows what else in the literary world.’ Beales’ special talent for promoting the work of others, whilst failing to produce work of his own, reached new heights during the war. Increasingly, he had come to associate himself primarily with the LSE sociology faculty, serving on the editorial board of Political Quarterly and the school’s Agenda magazine, devoted to postwar social reconstruction. During the war, when the school relocated to Cambridge, he employed the sociologists Norbert Elias and Karl Mannheim as his personal ‘Senior Research Assistants’, though they were given free rein to pursue their own work. His short book The Making of Social Policy (1946) was a historical excursus into social reform meant primarily as a criticism of Hayek’s Road to Serfdom (1944). His claim in Political Quarterly that the 1945 General Election was irreversible, and that the Labour Party would henceforth be the sole party of government, was over-optimistic. Beales remained an important part of the faculty when it was relocated to Cambridge during the war where he kept a house, regularly putting up Harold Laski, Lionel Robbins, and Friedrich Hayek when they travelled to and from London.

Throughout his career, Beales encouraged students to think about ways in which social theory and history interacted. A number of students, such as Bernard Crick, Oliver MacGregor, and Neil Smelser became historically-minded social theorists. Beales’ work at the LSE established many bridges between social history and sociology and was instrumental in creating a non-Marxist conception of social change, rich with historical data. The work of Oliver McGregor, Chelly Halsey, John Goldthorpe, Bernard Crick and other sociologically-minded historians (or historical sociologists) owed a great deal to Beales.

Yet Beales was overlooked by the committee which sought to appoint a new Professor of Economic History in 1944. His application criticized the subject as a whole for ‘too specialized concern’: ‘I should like to see the range of the work of the department amplified so that any danger of the undue subordination of it to the demands of economics may be lessened. I should wish to maintain the relationships of economic history with other branches of historical study, and to strengthen its connexions with other departments of social sciences.’ Beales was blocked by the committee: both for his lack of publications and his inability to work with economists. The chair went to T.S. Ashton, an avowedly liberal economic historian from Manchester. Ashton’s inaugural lecture, ‘The Relation of Economic History to Economic Theory’, was anathema to Beales’ conception of history, explicitly
allying the subject to theory: ‘Economic history…is concerned with large groups: with the
general, rather than with the particular; with processes, rather than with events; with the
typical, representative or statistical fact, rather than with the unique individual fact.’ Whilst
labelling Beales, along with Tawney and the Hammonds, as pioneers of social history, he
also signalled that social history was a thing of the past, and that henceforth the department
would work closely with the Economics Faculty. As Beales noted:

The school was different after the war. It was different again because it got very
departmentalized and the economic history was one subject in many. I think that under
Ashton it got too close to economics it was to be in effect a theory proving body of
factual knowledge…His work was much better than perhaps that particular idea which
appeared in his inaugural lecture but the school after the war was never quite the same
thing.  

Ashton’s wider interventions in public life were based on his prestige as a respected
academic. His extremely successful short introduction The Industrial Revolution (1948),
published by Oxford University Press’ Home University Library (a hardback equivalent of
Pelican Books), put out a robust and compelling account of the benefits wrought by the
Industrial Revolution. He was also a founding member of the Mont Pelerin Society of
neoliberal economists, contributing a central chapter to Friedrich Hayek’s volume Capitalism
and the Historians (1954), attacking the intellectual bias of left-wing historians. Where
Beales suggested a variety of possible interpretations of the Industrial Revolution, Ashton
preferred a single one: that of cumulative economic development raising material standards
of living throughout society.

Ashton was at the forefront of the LSE’s drift away from its socialist roots in the
immediate postwar period, following the deaths of Sidney Webb and Laski (in 1947 and 1950
respectively). New faculty members including Michael Oakeshott, Karl Popper, Edward
Shils, and J.W.N. Watkins, along with a number of existing members such as Robbins and
Hayek, were committed to a tradition liberal and conservative political and economic thought
largely alien to Beales. Beales was increasingly at odds with the school, and the department
which had spurned his hopes of promotion; refusing to set foot in the department after his
retirement: ‘the school after the war was never quite the same thing. Before it was informal,
associative and free. Afterwards it seemed to be more stereotyped more departmentalized
more the subject of the administrators attention and less that of the independent teachers.’
vii. A very social historian

Yet it was from the 1950s onwards, when Beales no longer spoke on the BBC or edited Pelican Books, and when he was academically marginalized, in which his influence really came into its own. Beales was a superlative (if largely unsystematic) lecturer and an inspiring supervisor: eager to stimulate and suggest new ideas and interpretations. Donald Coleman, by no means an unqualified admirer, noted:

His lectures were remarkable performances which exemplified the man. They were a compound of erudition and laziness, of immense knowledge (stemming from his private library of nineteenth century social history), and of a total indifference to formal organisation…They regularly had the same effect on his audience: the bored departed, the enquiring were hooked and stayed.  

Such an opinion was echoed by Bernard Crick, Beales’ supervisee and co-author in the 1950s, who highlighted his remarkable qualities as a charismatic lecturer: ‘He wandered, like Doctor Who, all over time and space. But his lectures were the very stuff of Social History – whether or not they were called “Economic History”.’  

Beales supervised a great number of students: never fewer than twelve and sometimes as many as twenty per year. His informal weekly seminar, held at the nearby Old White Horse Inn (largely as a means of spiting the department), was a central hub of social historians and sociologists.  

W.E. Williams noted Beales’ habit for giving others the central ideas of books he wished to write, who would actually do the research: ‘I have heard him describe the dozens of [books] he would like to write, they aren’t yet written. But he gives his ideas away to others. I could name here and now a score of outstanding works of history and political philosophy which were engendered in the mind of Beales and written by someone else.’ In the words of his student, the historian T.C. Barker, ‘there has never been any other Economic History teacher who has been responsible for getting more books written.’ Beales supervised at least two hundred PhDs, with acknowledgments in over one hundred and fifty books. Beales taught or influenced many prominent historians and writers including William Ashworth, Asa Briggs, John Burnett, Henry Cassirer (first Communications Director of UNESCO), Bernard Crick, H.J. Dyos, A.H. Halsey, J.F.C. Harrison, W.H. Henderson, O.R. McGregor, Harold Perkin, Sidney Pollard (whom he co-supervised with Ashton), John Saville, N.J. Smelser, Dorothy Thompson, Alexander Wilson, and the Communist poet John Cornford, who was the first British casualty of the Spanish Civil War. Beales was also a key influence on Richard Hoggart, who acknowledged him in The Uses of Literacy (1957). After reading the manuscript, Beales impressed upon Hoggart the
material improvements in working class life during the twentieth century that he felt the account lacked.  

As Miles Taylor has correctly suggested, Beales was one of the key historians instrumental in establishing British social history as an independent discipline. With Oliver McGregor, he edited the first series of volumes dedicated to the subject: the Heinemann Kingswood Social History Series. Beales was a founding member of the Society for the Study of Labour History and was the first President of the Social History Society in 1976. He also served, for many years, on the editorial board for the Dictionary of Labour Biography, for which he wrote many articles. At Beales’ ninetieth birthday celebration (he lived to be ninety-nine), attended by over forty professors who were his former students, the social policy maker, Lord Oliver McGregor acknowledged ‘when you began work, social history, in this country at any rate, consisted of a demonology of capitalists and a hagiography of labour leaders. You created a new subject; you created Victorian society.’

viii. Conclusion: Beales as Historian
Unequivocally, Beales failed as an academic historian. On an grand scale, he failed to produce work. He managed to alienate almost everyone he worked with from R.H. Tawney and Lionel Robbins to W.E. Williams. Beales carried out little or nothing in the way of actual research and propagated no new interpretation of the Industrial Revolution. Nonetheless, Beales was an important mediator, who acted as an excellent populariser of history, and who exerted an immense influence on the subject and its wider reception. His commitment to the ‘engaged tradition’ of adult education, and the importance he attached to the study of the Industrial Revolution were matched by his openness of approach. He was effective as a broadcaster, publisher, and teacher because he refused to see the subject as purely limited to either the economic or the social, but a mixture of several factors. For Beales, and countless others during this period, the industrial past underpinned the nature of contemporary society. Understanding the period was vital as a means of understanding the present.

Beales lived in a period which saw the huge expansion of the English historical profession, and the increasing specialization of disciplines. Whilst in the 1920s it was simple, even natural, to be an economic historian mostly interested in social history, for whom the widest possible audience was a central concern, such an existence was increasingly uncommon. Beales’ great failure was in producing a book which established him as a public intellectual, along the lines of Tawney, Cole, or E.P. Thompson. Asa Briggs, the social historian whose work as educational reformer and broadcaster, most closely resembles
Beales’ extra-academic career, remains a widely-respected (and prolific) historian in both academic and public spheres. Beales’ primary importance was behind the scenes: on various editorial boards, as a reviewer, publisher, and broadcaster of other people’s ideas, and as a teacher and supervisor. For historiographers hoping to understand the development of historical thought in the twentieth century, and especially those looking for the wider cultural impact of historians, Beales provides a useful counter-example to classical accounts of professional specialization and the dichotomy between academic and popular history. Beales is an important example of the ways in which conceptions of the past emerged throughout twentieth century Britain. Without his laying the groundwork, and tireless support of younger voices, the emergence of social history in the early 1960s as a subject par excellence may have been far less assured.

Today, the weight put on academic output – both in the study of historiography and in increasingly REF-conscious history departments – risks neglecting the importance of cultural and intellectual networks by which history is presented to a wider audience. In this period, at least, ‘impact’ was implicit within the act of teaching or writing history. The categories of ‘academic’ or ‘popular’ historian were, and still are, more fluid and contested than is commonly thought. As Beales said at his ninetieth birthday celebrations: ‘you can’t really separate human experience into neat tabloids as we have to do in books and lectures, knowing all the time that it’s a pretty unreal process.’
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Notes

Beales, “‘Great Trade Depression’”.

For instance, see Cannadine, *History and Media*; de Groot, *Consuming History*.
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