Alun Howkins, 1947–2018: Introduction

SAYER, K. and VERDON, Nicola <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3538-9496>

Alun Howkins, 1947-2018: an introduction

Karen Sayer and Nicola Verdon

This Special Issues arises from a workshop held at the University of Sussex in early July 2014 in honour of Professor Alun Howkins. This small workshop brought together a range of scholars who had either been taught or supervised by Alun, or had a close connection to him via the university or the scholarly field of rural history.[1] The essays in this volume include revised and expanded versions of papers delivered by Maggie Andrews, Hilary Crowe, Sian Edwards, Karen Sayer and Nicola Verdon. These have been supplemented by an additional essay commissioned for this collection by Alan Malpass. There are others who spoke at the workshop, Carl Griffin, Vic Gammon, Malcolm Chase, Clare Griffiths, Gary Moses, Lucy Robinson and Lucy Noakes, some of whose work appears elsewhere.[2] Alun attended the event, commented extensively and perceptively on every paper and knew that this edition was in preparation before his death.

His death, in July 2018, has deprived modern British history of one of its most influential and charismatic academics. His background and his non-traditional route into academia framed his approach to history and his delivery of it. He was born in 1947 in Bicester, Oxfordshire, to a working-class family. Bicester like many a small rural market town at that time was undergoing post-war transformation. Drawing upon A. E. Houseman's famous poem 'Into my heart an air that kills', Alun later wrote that 'the background to my own story – the land of lost content where "… I went and cannot come again" is my past as well as the past of rural England and Wales'.[3] On failing the eleven-plus, he attended Highfield Secondary Modern School, leaving at the age of 15. Over the next couple of years he worked locally in and around

Bicester and Oxford in a variety of jobs. The first was as an agricultural apprentice on local farms. The Oxfordshire countryside was one of 'rich farm land', which in his own words, he 'helped to work as the lowest of the low – a "boy"'. It was also a mechanised world: 'I could remember horses as a child but they had all gone, replaced by tractors, by the time I stood in the harvest field'.[4] He went on to work for the Central Ordnance Depot in Bicester, as a copyeditor for Pergamon Press and a bookseller at Blackwell's in Oxford, becoming increasingly drawn into the folk music and jazz scene, youth theatre and political groups in the area. He then went to work for Longmans in Harlow as a copywriter.[5]

In 1968, six years after leaving school, Alun was awarded a grant from the Department of Education to study at Ruskin College, Oxford. He went initially to study Politics and Economics, with a view to working in the trade union movement, but he soon switched to History under the guidance and encouragement of Raphael Samuel, who also introduced him to the History Workshop movement, and remained his lifelong mentor and friend. Encouraged by Samuel's view that every student had a history to tell and could become the authors of their own history, he began to work on the rural poor in Oxfordshire, researching the Whitsun holiday (later published as a History Workshop Pamphlet) and writing a dissertation on poaching in the county in the mid nineteenth century.[6]

Between 1970 and 1973 he studied for a BA in History at Queen's College, Oxford, before moving to the University of Essex to undertake his PhD under the guidance of Paul Thompson. The move from a 'conventional history "school" at Oxford' to the Department of Sociology at Essex was, he wrote, an 'enormous' shock. There he undertook a study of Norfolk rural society, outlining how the growth of radicalism and trade unionism was closely embedded in the local culture and

consciousness of the county. The oral history interviews he conducted with the men and women who had worked on the land in the early part of the twentieth century transformed his historical understanding, leading him to ask new questions and interrogate 'the nuance they gave to historical material'. His approach shifted 'from being a "labour historian" to being, I hope, a historian of the Norfolk labourer'. This research went on to be published as his first major book, *Poor Labouring Men: Rural Radicalism in Norfolk 1870-1923*.[7]

In 1976 Howkins began his first teaching post, at the University of Sussex. He remained there for the rest of his career, firstly in the School of Cultural and Community Studies, then the School of English and American Studies and following restructuring, the School of Humanities, where he was the first Director of the Graduate School. He was promoted to Professor in 2000, and retired in 2009. If he was nurtured and moulded by his early days at Ruskin and then Essex, the University of Sussex, based on its founding principle of interdisciplinarity, gave him the perfect space to develop his academic dexterity. He was comfortable in social, political, cultural and economic history, and published on a wide range of subjects connected to leisure and popular culture, left-wing politics, art and folk music, amongst other things.[8] His central commitment however was always to the history of the countryside, and to disseminating that history in an accessible and engaging way. He was the author of two further books, *Reshaping Rural England*, which covered the period 1850 to 1925, and *The Death of Rural England*, a broad social history of the twentieth-century countryside, and was a major contributor to volume seven of the Agrarian History of England and Wales, published in 2000.[9] He also wrote for the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, was a contributor to the *New Statesman* in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and wrote and presented a number of

TV and radio broadcasts, most significantly *Fruitful Earth*, a four-part history of British food and farming for BBC2, broadcast in 1999.[10]

***

Howkins was at the forefront of the emergence of 'new' rural history in the 1990s. Where rural history fitted within the established fields of social history, labour history and agricultural history, was one of his early chief concerns. Howkins always insisted on the necessity of digging into the human stories, individual and collective, that lay behind the data, a call to speak to and find the words of the labourers themselves where possible. He wrote in *Poor Labouring Men*, 'I also hope that through the work the voice of the labourer is heard, and that a real sense of his or her hopes, fears and aspirations comes through. If it does not then I will have failed'.[11] In many ways this was part of his Ruskin training, but it was also formed from his frustration with the rural past as represented by the form of (economic) agricultural history that originally dominated the post-Second World War profession, and continued to be influential in the 1980s and early 1990s. In two articles published in the leading journal of the field, *Agricultural History Review*, in 1992 and 1994, he accused agrarian history of 'an intellectual arrogance', which meant there was 'seldom a human face seen'. As he explained,

> the methods and ideas of economic history still dominate much writing about rural England in the last century … it does tend to stress the formal production and functional nature of the farm worker – crudely he is a factor of production, along with capital and land, who functions within a set of

> paradigms defined by ideas like ‘yield’, ‘productivity’, ‘labour costs’ and ‘labour markets’.[12]

This model was dominated by an Anglo-centrism (and within that a focus on the southern and eastern English counties), which confined the experiences of Wales, Scotland and Ireland to the ‘fringes’, and was concerned overwhelmingly with the male worker.

The social history of modern Britain, meanwhile, had been dominated by the urban and the industrial, ‘particularly true’, Howkins wrote in 2002, ‘of the traditions of radical and socialist historiography with which I have been identified all my working life’.[13] In a critical review of the three-volume *Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750-1950*, edited by F. M. L. Thompson and published in 1990, he highlighted the lack of material on social and productive systems, on regionality and on gender in rural areas, indeed the lack of rural material *per se*. As a social history of rural Britain the volumes, he argued, ‘are much weaker here than they are for the urban areas’. He went on:

> It could be argued that this approach is unfair, since much social history has been urban in direction, and agrarian history has not been ‘social’. Yet, at the most basic level for at least half of the period covered, Britain was a rural nation. In terms of localities even the ‘classic’ areas of industrialisation like Lancashire, Yorkshire or the north-east contained substantial and complex rural societies. One would expect, therefore, that the social history of the countryside would figure large even if it did not dominate the texts.[14]

The treatment of the rural within different traditions of labour history did not escape his opprobrium either. The view of early writers of labour history, such as the Hammonds and Reg Groves, which found echoes in later academic work, tended to see rural society as backward, conditions as oppressive and acquiescence of workers so total that any kind of resistance was impossible. Episodes of confrontation, such as the Swing Riots of the 1830s or the formation of agricultural trade unionism in the 1870s, were characterised as 'special cases'.[15] Other writing, which came out of post-war empirical sociology, highlighted the power the rural elite still held over the workplace, home and community life of farm workers in the second half of the twentieth century, and ascribed patchy agricultural unionism to structural political weaknesses.[16] Such traditions, Alun argued, 'have structured and often narrowed the focus of research on the labouring poor and excluded key areas of work'.[17] For Alun, a genuine rural social history was, throughout his career, an urgent project, and one that had, of necessity, an incendiary edge. As he put it, 'in its youth [social history] was a rebel, enraged, and angry at the history it uncovered, a history largely of poverty and waste'.[18] What he called for was 'An articulation of gender, of class, of place and of process' in rural history, which would, he hoped, 'create a genuine cultural history of the poor'.[19]

***

Collectively the essays in this volume seek to expand on some of the key themes that were central to Alun's work. The first is the place of the farm labourer. 'To many contemporaries and, until recently, to most historians the English farm labourer of

the nineteenth century was an unproblematic figure', he wrote in 1992. 'He had escaped labour and social history's concerns with a differentiated workforce and was portrayed as a single type. Unskilled, or at best semi-skilled, doomed to day labour and poor pay'.[20] Throughout his work Howkins showed in fact that rural society was highly complex and segregated, and within this, the farm workforce was dominated by occupational hierarchies and structures. To speak of the 'farm labourer' was therefore to conflate a whole range of experiences based upon different regional systems of farm production and hiring, upon age and skills, and upon gender. At the top of this 'continuum of labour' in the nineteenth century was the farm servant, hired on a long-term labour contract (six or twelve months), which included board and lodging and was upheld by law. But even within this group there were significant differences in working and living conditions depending upon region, farm size and gender. Next came the agricultural labourers who again were hired by a variety of systems, some of which offered a degree of security, some of which were extremely exploitative. The length of the hiring was key. Howkins points to the differentiation between the core or 'constant' agricultural labourers, hired across the whole of year, the 'ordinary' labourers, hired by the week (but whose employment could also be considered regular in that it continued across much of the year), and the 'truly casual' workers.[21] Although women made up a considerable part of the latter group, they also, Howkins argued, 'remained important to all branches of labour until the Great War … as a central part of the workforce without whom agricultural production could not have continued'.[22] 'What it meant to be a labourer in different areas of England', he argued, 'was literally to live in different worlds'.[23] Looking at the British experience further confounds the picture.

The complex nature of the farm workforce in the nineteenth century is the focus of the article by Nicola Verdon. Drawing upon Howkins' influential essay 'From Hodge to Lob', published in 1996, it assesses how far agricultural labour was seen as skilled labour in the Victorian era, how perceptions were shaped by contemporary attitudes towards women agricultural workers, and the ways that interpretations of skill shifted as technologies changed and farming became more mechanised.[24] Hierarchies of skill are shown to demarcate male agricultural workers from boyhood to adulthood, with weight and strength key determinants of wages and status. Farm work demanded knowledge and 'on-the-job' training in order to learn a wide range of seasonal tasks and, where hand labour dominated, proficiency in handling a number of farm implements. In contrast, few jobs undertaken by women were deemed skilled in the same ways as men's but women were seen as expert at some tasks and in some regions their labour was both necessary and valued. When farm work began to be transformed by machinery in the latter part of the nineteenth century, this introduced a new set of skills, which marginalised women, and later some men, to subsidiary workers, leading to lamentation about the decline of 'old' skills.

Later in the volume Karen Sayer asks to what extent the divisions highlighted by Verdon between higher-paid, more reliably-employed labourers working with animals and those working as 'ordinary' or casual labourers remained true into the twentieth century, especially in the post-Second World War era when there was widespread structural change in agriculture. In a period where many farmers became specialist producers, to meet new market demands, standardised practices and global trade systems, how did this impact on the farm worker? Sayer traces how 'labour' became separated from 'the labourer' in wartime and post-war rhetoric, with 'labour' becoming something abstract, that had to be managed to achieve efficiency

in agricultural production. Labour therefore was to be quantified for the purposes of cheap food production, and within this the ‘Standard Man Day’ became dominant in farming publications and was later adopted into official policy. Farm space thus came to be delineated by time, management and work. Sayer analyses how tensions arose between the ideas of labour efficiency and the understandings of skill and working practices as they played out on farms. Concentrating on the position of the stockman, she shows how they remained more highly paid than other agricultural workers because their expertise in managing stock was still essential and highly valued. A human element in farm work, and a degree of ‘knowing the animal’ that was not quantifiable, thus still persisted into the late twentieth century.

Whereas Verdon and Sayer’s articles approach the study of the farm labour force in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries from a national perspective (albeit an English one), Maggie Andrews makes the case for the importance of local studies, analysing how everyday gender politics played out in rural Worcestershire during World War One and its aftermath. She argues that local history needs to cross the academic divide and involve the participation of local people, following the best traditions of movements that Howkins was involved with, including early History Workshop conferences and oral history projects. Taking Samuel’s notion that ‘history is the work of a thousand different hands’, she shows that local history can be a way to unpick and complicate the ‘grand narratives’ that, even at the end of four years of commemoration, still tend to dominate the history of World War One. The result is a ‘messy’ history, as she puts it, of multiple stories and experiences. In a county dominated by smallholdings and market gardens, women traditionally combined domestic labour and agricultural labour, an established pattern of family labour in Worcestershire that continued during the war. Married women were often reluctant to

undertake further paid work, men recognised that their absence placed further burdens on women, and women's response to the wartime demand to grow more food was therefore varied according to individual social background, family circumstances and martial status. The organisations that emerged during the war to encourage and direct women's participation, such as the Women's War Agricultural Committee and the Women's Institutes, were dominated initially by titled women, some of whom had been involved in the suffrage movement, and who had the social capital locally to undertake volunteer work. Andrews shows that the social backgrounds of the women who participated were much broader. The Pershore WI ran a rabbit and pig club, briefly a National Kitchen and sought to improve everyday living and housing conditions for women. In the aftermath of war a focus on citizenship took precedence over agricultural production but few Worcestershire women moved into local politics after 1918.

The importance of the local case-study in revealing the complexities of regional rural society is also shown in the article by Hilary Crowe. It focuses on the farming community of the upland county of Westmorland in the interwar years. The fortunes of these years, Alun argued, were mixed, and although contemporaries popularised the image of unremitting depression, there was 'a great deal more success than many accounts allow'.[25] It is Crowe's view that amidst recent revisionist takes on the interwar period, the uplands of England have received little critical attention. She traces how the fortunes of farmers changed over the interwar years depending on altitude. Those who farmed the highest altitudes rebuilt their sheep flocks in the aftermath of war and remained profitable through the 1920s. However livestock prices collapsed in the 1930s and as government assistance concentrated on arable farming (a deficiency payment for sheep was not introduced until 1938),

the livelihood of these farmers became increasingly precarious. At lower altitudes, farmers were able to turn to dairy production and the guarantee of a regular milk cheque provided protection. There were other survival strategies. Farmers turned increasingly to the use of (unpaid) family labour to conserve cash reserves, and on larger farms the increasing use of mechanical mowers and milking machines also saved on the labour bill. Barter, exchange and community support were also key, with labour and equipment loaned. Some family members took paid work off the farm, or looked to diversification activities (such as bed and breakfast) to generate cash. Farmers also relied on understanding from landlords, who often deferred rent payments or supplied credit. Crowe argues that although there were many constraints on farming in the uplands between the wars, there were also areas of progress. Few farmers went bankrupt in interwar Westmorland and few failed to survive the depression.

Alan Malpass's article explores the attitude of the National Union of Agricultural Workers towards the employment of Axis Prisoners of War during and immediately after the Second World War. He notes that despite unprecedented growth in membership and recognition, historians have not been much concerned with the history of the NUAW in the mid twentieth century, instead focusing on its origins in the late nineteenth century and evolution in the interwar years. Alun ended *Poor Labouring Men* with an assessment of the 1923 'great strike' in Norfolk, a seminal moment in the history of agricultural trade unionism, which influenced the course the NUAW would take for decades afterwards, as it moved, under the presidency of Edwin Gooch from 1928, towards establishing a working relationship with employers and the state. Malpass takes this forward by analysing the position of the NUAW, which has until now been sidelined in studies of POW labour, and the

relationship between the union and the government in the 1940s. He shows that initially the government were reluctant to sanction the use of POW labour, as Italian POWs were more widely deployed from 1941, the NUAW were largely ambivalent. From 1943 this changed, and the union stepped up its resistance to POW labour, as more and more Germans were engaged and fears that local agricultural workers were being dismissed due to the availability of this cheap pool of labour escalated. POW labour was therefore seen to undermine the position of British workers. The union criticised the government for providing cheap labour, and farmers for using it. The NUAW argued that German POWs should be paid the going rate for the job (as set by the Agricultural Wages Board) and opposed the billeting of POWs on farms (rather than in camps). During the last couple of years of war, if the union grudgingly accepted POW labour as unwelcome but necessary, on the cessation of hostilities, they sought its removal. When repatriation was announced in 1946, the union continued to fight against the use of imported labour under programmes such as the European Volunteers Workers scheme, which recruited thousands of displaced persons from Central and Eastern Europe. The NUAW concentrated on fighting for improvements for British agricultural workers, especially over wage rates and living standards, reflecting genuine anxieties about the historic problem of agricultural recruitment and the position of agriculture as a whole in the post-war landscape.

The final article in this volume by Sian Edwards turns to the post-Second World War countryside and contributes to the debate on the place of ruralism within English national identity, another area where Howkins' work has been highly influential. Her article analyses the way rurality shaped the childhood narratives of people who grew up in mid twentieth century Britain. In doing so she adds an important corrective to the urban bias of youth studies. Her source is a 1995 directive

written by Alun and issued by Mass Observation to its panel of volunteer writers, which asked ‘Do you think the countryside has changed in your lifetime?’ 348 responses were received. She maps the emotional geographies of landscape, arguing that encounters with the countryside were formative in shaping respondents’ self-identity. For those who grew up in the countryside, the farms, animals and outdoors all represented space and freedom, contributing to a ‘good’ and ‘happy’ childhood, but they were also important to those urban dwellers who were visitors, on holiday or staying with family. The countryside could also be a site of adventure and opportunity, for both males and females, and allowed girls especially to subvert traditional gendered expectations of behaviour in mid-century England. Edwards goes on to explore how these responses are permeated by a concern about late 20th century childhood, and about changes to the nature of agriculture since the Second World War. Thus the ‘impersonal nature’ of highly mechanised farming and the increasing encroachment of the urban into the rural, all damaging for wildlife, landscapes, rural communities and people, was seen to contrast, for many correspondents, with their memories of their childhood landscapes, which they saw as more ‘authentic’ and ‘real’. Some however also consciously challenged a nostalgic narrative about the countryside, and saw progress in change, which led to better standards of living and more varied entertainment options for rural people. Like many other articles in this volume, Edwards’ work points to the variety of experiences in rural England, and outlines how rural childhoods were retold in complex and varied ways.

All the articles in the Special Edition have been decisively shaped by the scholarship of Alun Howkins. His oeuvre stands as a testament to his range and to his significance as the leading historian of modern rural society and culture. It is clear

that Howkins' legacy has reached a wider disciplinary circle. Recently, historical geographers Briony McDonagh and Carl Griffin, have for example re-assessed the position of the rural poor via the emergence of new legal frameworks such as those embodied in the Acts relating to Enclosure – which resulted in the policing of the spaces that the poor were permitted to access, a shift in the meaning of 'property' as the resources once accessible via common right were fenced off, and the generation of new forms of resistance as a result.[26] We hope that the articles published here stimulate further discussion and reflect the vibrancy of work being undertaken in rural history broadly conceived.

---

[1] We would like to acknowledge the funding that enabled the workshop to take place: Economic History Society Conference and Initiative award (£2000), History Workshop Journal Conference and Workshop Fund (£250) and the British Agricultural History Society conference and initiative fund (£500).

[2] Malcolm Chase, '"True Democratic Sympathy": Charles Stubbs, Christian Socialism, and English Labour, 1863–1912', *Labour History Review*, 83/1 (2018), pp. 1-28; Tom Akehurst, Tom, Louise Purbrick and Lucy Robinson, *Political Protest and the Police: Young People in Brighton* (Brighton, 2011); Lucy Noakes, 'Deep England': Britain, the countryside and the English in the Second World War', in Juliet Pattinson and Wnedy Ugolini, (eds), *Fighting for Britain?: Negotiating Identities in Britain During the Second World War* (New York, 2015), pp. 25-47. Carl Griffins' paper, 'The persistence of the discourse of starvation in the protests of the poor', forms a chapter of his new book, *The Politics of Hunger: Protest, Poverty and Policy in England, c. 1750-c. 1840* (forthcoming, Manchester University Press).

[3] Alun Howkins, *The Death of Rural England: A Social History of the Countryside since 1900* (London, 2003), p. 3

[4] Alun Howkins, 'George Ewart Evans', *History Workshop Journal*, 1/1 (1976), p. 254

[5] For a longer obituary see Nicola Verdon, 'Alun Howkins, 1947-2018', *History Workshop Journal*, forthcoming, Autumn 2019

[6] Alun Howkins, 'Whitsun in 19th century Oxfordshire', *History Workshop Pamphlets*, 8 (Oxford, 1974); Alun Howkins, 'The taming of Whitsun: the changing face of a nineteenth century rural holiday', in E. Yeo, and S. Yeo (eds), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590-1914: Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure* (Brighton, 1981), pp. 187-208; Alun Howkins, 'Economic crime and class law: poaching and the Game Laws, 1840-80', in S. B. Burman and B. E. Harrell-Bonds (eds), *The Imposition of Law* (London, 1979), pp. 273-87

[7] Alun Howkins, *Poor Labouring Men: Rural Radicalism in Norfolk 1870-1923* (London, 1985). All quotes in this paragraph are from the Introduction.

[8] See for example Alun Howkins, 'The Owslebury Lads', *Southern History*, 32 (2010), pp. 117-38; Alun Howkins, 'Blue remembered hills: painting and history', in Clive Adams, (Ed.), *Love, Labour and Loss: 300 Years of British Livestock Painting in Art* (Carlisle, 2002), pp. 53-69; Alun Howkins, 'History and the *Radio Ballads*', *Oral History*, 28/2 (2000), pp. 89-93; Alun Howkins and Linda Merricks, '"Dewy-eyed calves": live animal exports and middle-class opinion, 1960-1995', *Agricultural History Review*, 48/1 (2000), pp. 85-103; Alun Howkins, 'Land, locality, people, landscape: the nineteenth-century countryside', in M. Rosenthal, C. Payne and S. Wilcox, eds, *Prospects for the Nation: Recent Essays in British Landscape, 1751-1880* (New Haven and London, 1997), pp. 97-114; Alun Howkins, 'Politics or quietism: the social history of Nonconformity', in N. Virgoe and T. Williamson (eds),

Religious Dissent in East Anglia (Norwich, 1993), pp. 73-91; Alun Howkins and Linda Merricks, 'The ploughboy and the plough play', *Folk Music Journal*, 6/2 (1991), pp. 187-208; Alun Howkins and Ian Dyke, ' "The Time's Alteration": popular ballads, rural radicalism and William Cobbett', *History Workshop Journal*, 23/1 (1987), pp. 20-38; Alun Howkins, 'Class against class: the political culture of the Communist Party of Great Britain, 1930-35' in F. Gloversmith (Ed.), *Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s* (Brighton, 1980), pp. 240-57; Alun Howkins, 'Edwardian Liberalism and industrial unrest', *History Workshop Journal*, 4/1 (1977), pp. 143-62; Thea Vigne and Alun Howkins, 'The small shopkeeper in industrial and market towns' in G. J. Crossick, (Ed.), *The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914* (London, 1977), pp. 184-211

[9] Alun Howkins, *Reshaping Rural England: A Social History, 1850-1925* (London, 1991); Howkins, *Death of Rural England*; E. J. T. Collins (Ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Volume VII, 1850-1914* (Cambridge, 2000), see Part V, 'Rural Society and Community'.

[10] Produced by Richard Trayler-Smith for BBC 2 England, https://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk/a1dd7b9bdef24a4da4bc8b3d8a989ed1

[11] Howkins, *Poor Labouring Men*, p. xiii

[12] Alun Howkins, 'Social history and agricultural history', *Agricultural History Review*, 40/2, (1992), pp. 160-163, at p. 61; Alun Howkins, 'Peasants, servants and labourers: the marginal workforce in British agriculture, c. 1870-1914', *Agricultural History Review*, 42/1 (1994), pp. 49-62, at p. 50. In response see Richard Anthony, 'Farm Servant vs. Agricultural Labourer, 1870-1914: A Comment on Howkins', *Agricultural History Review*, 43/1 (1995), pp. 61-64 and Alun Howkins, 'Farm Servant vs Agricultural Labourer, 1870-1914: A Reply to Richard Anthony', *Agricultural*

History Review, 43/1 (1995), pp. 65-66

[13] Alun Howkins, 'From Diggers to Dongas: the land in English radicalism, 1649-2000', *History Workshop Journal*, 54/1 (2002), pp. 1-23, at p. 1

[14] Howkins, 'Social history and agrarian history', p. 161

[15] See for example, J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Village Labourer* (London, 1911); Reg Groves, *Sharpen the Sickle!* (London, 1949); Roger A. E. Wells, 'The development of the English rural proletariat and social protest, 1700-1850', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 6/2 (1979), pp. 115-139

[16] See for example Howard Newby, *The Deferential Worker* (Harmondsworth, 1979); Renee Danziger, *Political Powerlessness: Agricultural Workers in Post-War England* (Manchester, 1988)

[17] Alun Howkins, 'Labour history and the rural poor, 1850-1980', *Rural History*, 1/1 (1990), pp. 113-22, at p. 116

[18] Howkins, 'Social history and agricultural history', p. 163

[19] Howkins, 'Labour history and the rural poor', p. 120

[20] Alun Howkins, 'The English farm labourer in the nineteenth century: farm, family and community', in Brian Short (Ed.), *The English Rural Community: Image and Reality* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 85-104, at p. 102

[21] Alun Howkins, 'In the sweat of thy face: the labourer and work', in G. E. Mingay (Ed.), *The Vanishing Countryman* (London, 1989), pp. 42-56, at p. 45

[22] Howkins, 'Labour history and the rural poor', p. 118

[23] Howkins, 'The English farm labourer in the nineteenth century', p. 85

[24] Howkins, A., ''From Hodge to Lob: reconstructing the English farm labourer, 1870-1914', in Malcolm Chase and Ian Dyke (eds), *Living and loving: Essays in honour of J. F. C. Harrison* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 218-35

[25] Howkins, *Death of Rural England*, p. 75. See also Alun Howkins, 'Death and rebirth? English rural society 1920-1940', in Paul Brassley, Jeremy Burchardt and Lynne Thompson (eds), *The English Countryside Between the Wars: Regeneration or Decline?* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 10-25

[26] Briony McDonagh and Carl Griffin, 'Occupy! Historical geographies of property, protest and the commons, 1500-1850', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 53 (2016), pp. 1-10; Carl Griffin and Briony McDonagh (eds), *Remembering Protest in Britain since 1500: Memory, Materiality and the Landscape* (Basingstoke, 2018)