

---

**The Newsletter of  
The Economic History Society  
Issue 32**

**CONTENTS**

**NEWS**

News from the Society's President	2
Call for Host Cities, IEHA World Congress 2009	3

**REPORTS**

A Report on the Sixth Meeting of the Standing Conference	4
--	---

**FUTURE CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS**

Women's Committee of the Economic History Society Workshop 2003	13
ESTER Advanced Seminar Programme 2003-04	14
Urban History Group Meeting 2004	15
Southern Labour Studies Conference	16
73rd Anglo-American Conference of Historians	17
Economic & Business Historical Society Annual Conference 2004	18
Annual Conference for Developing Learning and Teaching in History	19
Second International Conference on German Cliometrics	19
XIVth International Economic History Congress 2006	20

**GRANTS AND AWARDS**

Economic History Society Travel Grants for Graduate Students	20
Economic History Society Facility Grants for Undergraduate Projects	21
Dan David Prize Scholarships 2004	21
National Awards for History Teaching in Higher Education, 2003-04	22
Biennial Prize for Young Scholars working on Banking History	23
Economic History Society Initiatives and Conference Fund	23

**PUBLICATIONS**

Living Economic and Social History	24
------------------------------------	----

---

*The Newsletter is distributed to individual members of the Economic History Society with each issue of the Economic History Review. Items for inclusion in the Newsletter should be sent to the Society's Administrative Secretary, preferably by e-mail (see inside back cover for details). The copy dates are 1 October, 1 January, 1 April and 1 July. Inclusion of items is at the discretion of the Honorary Secretary and subject to the availability of space. The Economic History Society cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy of information submitted for publication. The Newsletter does not accept commercial advertising.*

## NEWS FROM THE SOCIETY'S PRESIDENT

The Society's encouragement and support for new scholars continues. The first of a new series of electronic, illustrated, study packs for school students is available on the website (on the *Industrial Revolution*) with others forthcoming on *Poverty* and on *20<sup>th</sup> Century Dictators*. Suggestions for topics for future study packs would be most welcome, particularly from our schools members. The Society would also welcome suggestions about venues and programmes for further sixth form conferences. Departments willing to host such meetings as a boost to their recruitment, to strengthen links with local schools and colleges and to raise the profile of economic and social history as a degree subject should contact Nuala Zahedieh, Chair of the Schools and Colleges Committee (n.zahedieh@ed.ac.uk).

The popularity of the Residential Training Course for postgraduate students has this year been reflected in a record number of applications from which 12 worthy candidates have been selected from a variety of institutions. The course is, as usual, to be held at Chancellors, University of Manchester and will take place on 4-7 December. A little further along the career ladder, our four new research fellows for 2003-4 are now registered at the IHR where they can expect research mentoring from the new Director, Professor David Bates, and the opportunity to benefit from a variety of research seminars and an array of research resources. The Society is also to provide a number of bursaries for post grads to attend the postgraduate research methods course there and so our fruitful collaboration and association with the IHR continues.

The programme for the 2004 annual conference is almost complete, please consult the website for fuller information and booking forms. The conference promises to offer a variety of excellent sessions to suit all interests. The Tawney lecture will be given by Professor Riitta Hjerpe, of the University of Helsinki, President-elect of the International Economic History Association. The conference will be held at Royal Holloway College, Egham. In 2005 the University of Leicester is to be the venue and in 2006 the conference will be held at Reading and will be the first to be held alongside the conference of the Social History Society. There are to be some common sessions and social events.

The Society has again been active in responding to various consultation exercises. A paper was submitted to the ESRC Review of Allocation of Studentship Awards and a response made to the Roberts Review on the future of Research Assessment. The Society has also made a nomination to the ESRC Sociology, History, Anthropology and Resources (SHAR) Virtual College and six nominations for new Academicians to the Academy of Social Sciences. A liaison meeting with the ESRC and AHRB, jointly with the Social History Society and the Association of Business Historians, took place on Thursday, 23 October. A full report will appear in a future newsletter.

continued ...

The Society has been asked by the IEHA to make suggestions for the post of Secretary General and for one Sitting Member vacancy. If you would like to suggest a colleague in the discipline from either inside or outside the UK, please obtain their consent and submit the name to me or to Maureen Galbraith for consideration by the Council.

Finally the Society's drive to recruit more early career scholars is continuing to bear fruit with a significant number of new members joining in the last few months, the majority on student subscription. If established members could bolster this trend by publicising the work of the Society amongst new colleagues and postgraduate students this would be much appreciated. **The offer by the Society to host a recruitment reception and seminar at any HEI that wishes to participate remains open. The idea would be to provide refreshments and a lecture or talk on the nature, past and future, of economic and social history to postgraduates and other interested scholars. The academic content could be tailored to mesh with the early weeks of Masters or postgraduate induction programmes but invitations to provide receptions for undergraduates would also be welcomed. Please contact myself (hudsonp@cardiff.ac.uk) or Richard Sheldon (the Society's Membership and Recruitment Officer) (r.sheldon@bristol.ac.uk) if you wish to host a reception and lecture for your students.**

All that remains is to wish colleagues well in the new academic year 2003-4 and I look forward to seeing many of you at the conference in April, which will be my last as President of the Society.

*Pat Hudson*



## **CALL FOR HOST CITIES XVTH WORLD ECONOMIC HISTORY CONGRESS 2009 INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC HISTORY ASSOCIATION**

In 2005 preparations for the organisation of the XVth World Economic History Congress of 2009, organised by the International Economic History Association (IEHA), will begin. The Executive Committee of the IEHA therefore invites potential host cities and local organisers to suggest venues for the congress in 2009.

Proposals for the host city should include: a general outline of the congress' format, a description of the congress venue, a budget for the congress, the names of the local organising committee, and the name of the person who will be primarily responsible for the organisation of the Congress. This person may or may not be a member of the current Executive Committee.

For further details on the proposed procedure for selecting host cities, please contact: Secretary General, Prof. Dr. J.L. van Zanden, c/o IISG, Cruquiusweg 31, 1019 AT, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. E-mail: [ieha@iisg.nl](mailto:ieha@iisg.nl)

The deadline for submissions is: 30 June 2004.

---

**A REPORT ON THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE STANDING  
CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF DEPARTMENTS OF  
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY  
21 JUNE 2003 • LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS**

This meeting of the Standing Conference was called to discuss the potential implications of proposed changes in university funding for the higher education sector in general and for teaching and research in Economic and Social History in particular. A list of delegates can be found at Appendix 1.

The following documents, all published in recent months, were the focus of discussion: the White Paper on the Future of Higher Education (<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/highereducation/>); the HEFCE Strategic Review of Funding ([http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2003/03\\_12.asp](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2003/03_12.asp)); the Report of the Roberts Review of Research Assessment (<http://www.rareview.ac.uk/reports/roberts.asp>)

In addition, Professor Floud drew attention to a further policy document on Dual Support and Sustainability (<http://www.ost.gov.uk/policy/invest-innov.htm#innovationsupport>), published recently by the Office of Science and Technology. This adds considerable weight to the general drift of policy, particularly insofar as this affects the extent and distribution of research funding.

The White Paper and the HEFCE review relate only to England, though they may have implications for the rest of the UK; the others are at UK level.

The main issues were raised in very useful introductory presentations by Professor Roderick Floud, President, Universities UK and Vice Chancellor, London Metropolitan University, and by Professor Rick Trainor, Vice Chancellor, University of Greenwich and Honorary Secretary of the Society.

Roderick Floud emphasised the perceptions that have directed recent policy proposals. The Sustainability Review is premised upon the notion that research in this country has not been properly funded largely because it has been underpriced (including work done for research councils and government departments). For this reason research infrastructures have been neglected. It is thus argued that research in future must be priced to cover fixed capital and other overheads as well as variable costs. This will result in fewer projects being funded but the Review stresses that too much research has been done in the past and that quality is required rather than quantity. In order to achieve higher quality and sustainability the thrust of the proposal is for greater concentration of research

continued ...

at international standards of excellence. This would involve some separation of research from undergraduate teaching (at a time when other countries that have research-only institutes seem to be moving away from them).

Professor Floud emphasised that British research is already more concentrated than anywhere else in the world. There is much talk of emulating the USA but one could only achieve US levels of dispersal of research by scrapping RAE-based funding and giving all of the money to the research councils. And it would not be possible to emulate the level of funding of the top US universities unless we reduced the entire UK research university sector to one institution (six in the whole of Europe)!

Rick Trainor assisted the audience in finding their way through the various documents and their implications. At the crux of them all, and most controversial in fundamentally influencing the underlying concept of a university, is the proposal to separate teaching from research. There is differentiation already but no university rejects research and none rejects teaching: they are there in different mixes and there is overwhelming support for their inseparability despite these proposals.

It is proposed that higher education teaching should increasingly be seen as a career in itself and that some institutions should move away from research entirely, in some cases increasing their role in knowledge transfer (though it is not clear how effective or up to date knowledge transfer would be where it takes place from teaching-only institutions). The policy is described as one of mission diversification and differentiation in which the introduction of differential fees, of two year foundation degrees and of a new way of evaluating research output via a new form of the RAE (outlined in the Roberts Review proposals) would all play a part.

### *Discussion*

There was lively discussion in the remainder of the morning session and after lunch debate was renewed and assisted by short introductions from Nigel Goose (on teaching), Richard Hoyle (on research) and Mary Morgan (on the implications of the proposed Roberts reforms). There was a general consensus of opposition to the majority of the proposals and recognition that their impact on the university sector in general and upon the arts and social sciences in particular was likely to be very negative.

continued ...

Many points were covered but the focus repeatedly returned to three aspects in particular:

1. The extent to which the proposals are based on a science model of university funding, teaching and research and upon a misunderstanding of how the arts and social sciences function within the higher education sector and in relation to wider society. There was unanimous support for maintaining a dispersed model of research in the arts and humanities in general and in our field in particular. This was seen as the best model to encourage more and better quality research from a variety of perspectives and for a variety of purposes. It was seen as important to raise the profile of arts and social sciences in such a way as to highlight their distinctive contribution to social welfare and civil society as well as to innovation and wealth creation. The emphasis upon immediate and purely utilitarian and pragmatic outcomes for research, particularly in terms of wealth creation, naturally foregrounds the science model.

Partly (but not wholly) because of their science orientation, the policy proposals also see knowledge as product or content, produced in big centres, disseminated by a specialised distribution network of knowledge exchanges (see White Paper and HEFCE Strategy) and received/used by consumers. Yet current teaching and learning, thinking and policy see knowledge as a process. This is in line with a research model of learning that emphasises skills and understanding rather than the transmission of concrete knowledge on the Roberts model. The best teaching – concerned with transmitting knowledge as a skill and a process – is informed by both research findings and research process, and therefore requires research-active staff.

The assumption that there are large economies of scale in research is not proven even in science and there is little evidence at all in social science and the arts. We do not have good models for the growth of science and it is irrational to try to control a system which is poorly understood. Current (dispersed) research performance is good by international standards (arguably it was even better before the government began to set targets).

Where history specifically is concerned dispersal of research has positive advantages not just in encouraging a plethora of approaches, and new ideas and methods, but in encouraging work on local and regional history and regional networks between archivists and historians to the benefit of both. Research concentration in history would discourage such research and associated relationships.

continued ...

2. The mistaken understanding about how research and teaching combine and the value of that combination. The need to defend the integration of teaching and research was viewed as a priority. Apart from the intellectual merits, the proposal to separate the two (and particularly to create universities which do not have research degree awarding powers) goes against the progress towards European integration and collaboration between HEIs, embodied in the recent Bologna Declaration. Teachers, for example, need to be able to distinguish between good and bad information and can only do so by being involved in research.

Teaching should not be seen as mechanical whilst research is creative: each is both mechanical and creative in combination. Some of the major improvements in undergraduate history teaching in recent decades have been due to the introduction of dissertation work based on primary as well as secondary sources. Practical skills in the location, identification and analysis of primary evidence are the most important transferable skills in history teaching at all levels. The analysis of texts and goblets, together with historiographical and bibliographical skills, cannot be taught without a research culture. Skills such as analysing evidence, decision making based upon evidence, team working, interactive learning, personal initiatives, are all transmitted in the context of research activities. The very nature of the teaching of history is testing the validity of explanations which can only be done with reference to the evidence i.e. research. Good teaching in history in particular is about giving students direct access to sources, artefacts, live debates. Cutting edge thinking about teaching in history meshes with a research-based model of learning. This is able to take advantage of the current drive, backed by state and charitable funding, towards making archives and sources accessible to a wider public via the Web, digitisation etc, which in turn strengthens the links between historians, archivists and archive users. Such access to sources and professional links makes for excellent teaching and learning in history.

The concentration of research resources into a few institutions is likely in the arts, and in history especially, to lead to intellectual stultification and orthodoxy rather than to new perspectives. Pluralism and dispersal are the contexts in which innovative new ideas are most likely to flourish.

Finally, the separation of teaching from research (together with the introduction of higher fees and foundation degrees) runs in the face of policies against social exclusion that the government advocates. The rhetoric suggests that many institutions will specialise in excellent teaching and be encouraged to

continued ...

extend their widening access policies but such proposed teaching institutions are not necessarily those described as leading or best practice in teaching quality assessments currently. Those students able to pay high fees will continue to opt for undergraduate courses in research-intensive institutions. Thus a small group of elite students (generally from privileged social backgrounds) will continue to be educated in research-intensive institutions and will emerge with qualifications that have higher status than the mass of students who will be trained in teaching-only universities. Degrees in teaching-only universities will not only be impoverished through not being taught by research-active academics but they will also be devalued by the hierarchical and elitist nature of the policy proposals. Students from poorer backgrounds who have opted for institutions with lower fees (which will generally be the teaching-only places) will have fewer opportunities for later advancement, particularly in academic careers. In terms of academia as a profession ‘excellent researchers’ will continue to be predominantly white, male and middle class.

3. The extent to which the proposed policies of research concentration and of separating teaching and research will result in the destruction of existing and future human capital in academic life by abrogating implicit contractual commitments and by truncating career prospects for many. The policy proposals are mainly concerned with the allocation of expenditure flows with little concern for the assets of higher education and especially the capacity to regenerate human capital. Human capital takes a very long time to build up but is likely to be rapidly dissipated under the current proposals. The withdrawal of research funding from most universities will mean writing off a large proportion of the human capital and will be particularly destructive of the many individual, high level researchers working in departments which have low research ratings.

Government defection from the implicit contract which it made in persuading individuals to invest their abilities in academe, will make it much more difficult and expensive to recruit new academics. Academic careers will become much less rewarding and much more risky. The brain drain will accelerate and reasons for choosing a career in academe vis à vis other sectors will evaporate. If 80% of the profession are told that their work will in future almost entirely be in teaching this will intensify the struggle, identified in the White Paper, to employ the best academics. If the only research openings are to be in a restricted number of research universities, then committing to an academic research career will become too much of a gamble for most young people to make.

continued ...

Some knowledge of the life cycles of individual researchers would assist in seeing the medium and longer-term impact of the proposed policies upon human capital formation. There is a great deal of variance over time in academic performance. High-flying scholars often start off in low ranked departments and only arrive at the top well into their careers. Individuals have periods of high and low productivity. Departments and universities rise and fall. By restricting research to a small number of locations these dynamics will be restricted to those institutions alone while locking out the majority of active scholars from any prospect of progression and improvement. A young academic whose first post is in a non-research-intensive university would find it very difficult to move to a research-active institution. It is likely that students who graduate from teaching-only institutions will have lower premiums in terms of salary than graduates from research universities even if they enter the university teaching-only profession. Graduates from teaching-only departments will also find it difficult to transfer to do research at postgraduate level compared with their contemporaries who graduate in research institutions so there will be little scope for encouraging bright graduates from non-research universities to consider an academic research career.

It is not clear how much of an academic hinterland is required for a productive academic community, and whether a small number of departments made up exclusively of ‘Chiefs’ without any ‘Indians’, would be viable. The American system, which policymakers admire, has a great deal of both depth and breadth. Research takes place at every level, and careers are open to talent at every level – quite the opposite of the proposed reforms. If the UK is to move in the direction of ‘payment by results’, then in the longer term it will not be possible for universities to offer long-term employment contracts. The resulting casualisation of employment (already a problem) will further reduce the attractions of academic work. The USA, which has the most ‘flexible’ labour markets, nevertheless protects and cherishes the institution of academic tenure. Arguably the prospect of tenure makes it possible for aspiring scholars to make the long-term commitment to scholarship that is required to produce high-quality research.

#### *Potentially positive elements*

In addition to addressing the likely negative impact of the proposed policies, the debate also tried to address where there might be potential for economic and social history to take advantage of some of the more peripheral, but still important,

continued ...

policy elements if and when the new policies are introduced. It is difficult to know how much attention will genuinely be paid to ‘protecting pockets of high-quality research’ in non-research-intensive universities, and how much such references are lip service to sweeten the pill of policies which pull strongly against this. If this is a genuine concern, the associated encouragement of collaboration between institutions ‘to ensure that isolated pockets of research secure funding’ might be assisted by the Society (see below). The idea is that more diversity of mission will make collaboration (rather than competition) easier. The Promising Researcher Fellowship scheme would provide opportunities for exchange and for movement of staff from one sort of institution to another. The establishment of 20 new knowledge exchanges to be exemplars of good practice in interactions between less research-intensive institutions and regional businesses and governments was noted but it is difficult to see how these exchanges would function to convey up to date knowledge, ideas and practices without their members being heavily involved in research.

The emphasis upon the need for closer regional and local links and knowledge transfer between HEIs and wider society could be exploited to justify more regional and local historical research, more links with archivists and museums which the Society might work to encourage.

#### *Proposals for action by the Society*

We should join with other like-minded organisations and societies to make forceful representations opposing the main thrust of the current policy reforms. In addressing the government on these issues it may be worth explaining our objections in terms of prospective scenarios of the likely outcomes if the policies are adopted. It is also important to emphasise the misunderstandings upon which the proposals are based (particularly the generalised assumptions of the science model of HE, the level of existing research concentration in the UK in international comparative perspective and the extent of dispersal of research and integration of teaching with research that characterises the US system). Another lobbying strength would be to point out the conflict between these proposals and other aspects of government policy such as equal opportunities, social inclusion, regional policy/devolution.

1. We should lobby forcefully against the separation of teaching and research employing the arguments above. We should argue that all HEI’s should continue

continued ...

to be assessed (in their research and teaching) in the same way. The annexe to the Roberts Report, which includes a discussion of the responses to the initial invitation to contribute, points out that ‘ ... most respondents expressing a preference agreed that all HEIs should continue to be assessed in the same way’ (p.81); and yet the Report proposes three cumbersome and divisive systems.

2. We should continue to lobby against any further concentration of research funding using information above to make the case why this is not the best model for history.

3. The Society should take part in the wider general debate about the future of human capital in the sector as a whole, the Government’s defection from implicit contracts and the dismal prospects for recruitment of the best researchers, throughout the HE sector, in the future.

4. The Society should encourage and assist with collaboration between institutions and between researchers from different institutions. There is encouragement for this in the White Paper and HEFCE report and such collaborations may also assist in the RAE. Critical mass in the arts and social sciences is not dependent upon large institutions and research concentration but is facilitated by networks sustained through conferences, events, seminars and learned societies: the latter could play an even greater role.

5. Concerning the Roberts review, the Society should be very wary of the implications of moving to far fewer assessment panels if this part of the Roberts proposals goes ahead. We should lobby the ESRC directly in response to the Roberts review for economic and social history to be included in the social science domain (either as a sub panel, or as an interdisciplinary panel). If we are not in the social sciences, the ESRC may ignore our subject whilst the AHRB has not fully recognised it so we may be left in a funding limbo. Also the choice of metrics for RAE assessment makes a big difference when economic and social history are compared with some of the other social sciences (e.g. books versus articles); we should argue that the sub-panel or interdisciplinary panel decides the metrics, not the main panels.

6. The devolution debate may provide a context for advocating very different proposals based upon regional institutions (emulating the US system of state universities rather than Harvard or Yale).

continued ...

This report was compiled by Pat Hudson but contains extracts and sections from written submissions from many of those who attended, including: Avner Offer, Helen Meller, Robert Poole, Louise Jackson, Richard Sheldon, Mary Morgan, Rosemary O'Day, Ray Stokes, Nigel Goose, Michael Sanderson, Alan Fowler, Neil Forbes, David Stead, Richard Hawkins.

## Appendix 1

### List of delegates

Maxine Berg	University of Warwick
Barry Doyle	University of Teesside
Waltraud Ernst	University of Southampton
Roderick Floud	London Metropolitan University
Neil Forbes	Coventry University
Alan Fowler	Manchester Metropolitan University
Nigel Goose	University of Hertfordshire
Richard Hawkins	University of Wolverhampton
Richard Hoyle	University of Reading
Pat Hudson	Cardiff University
Louise Jackson	Leeds Metropolitan University
Peter Kirby	University of Manchester
Helen Meller	University of Nottingham
Mary Morgan	London School of Economics
Rosemary O'Day	The Open University
Avner Offer	University of Oxford
Robert Poole	St. Martin's College
Michael Sanderson	University of East Anglia
Richard Sheldon	University of Bristol
David Stead	University of York
Ray Stokes	University of Glasgow
Steven Tolliday	University of Leeds
Rick Trainor	University of Greenwich

**WOMEN'S COMMITTEE OF THE ECONOMIC HISTORY SOCIETY  
FOURTEENTH ANNUAL WORKSHOP  
7 – 8 NOVEMBER 2003 • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH  
INFORMATION AND SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE: FROM GOSSIP TO THE INTERNET**

This workshop brings together social and economic historians, historians of science and technology and social scientists to explore the various applications of the concept of information in historical studies and discuss the ways in which attention to people's access to knowledge and the systems (formal and informal, human and mechanical) for its transmission can help us to understand social order and economic action. We are reminded daily that we are experiencing an 'information revolution', that since the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century we have been living in an 'information society' and that in the 21<sup>st</sup> our children will have to find their place in a 'knowledge society'. Accounts of this purported epochal shift in the social functions of information focus on the dialectic between a growing demand for specific knowledges and the development of uniquely powerful and dynamic technologies for generating, storing and communicating data. The social and imaginative impacts of digital and computer technologies have been described in terms of actual transformations in the labour process and the conditions of economic life, and a potential for radically new kinds of relationships among individuals, between individuals and society, and between human and machine. Historians have begun to test this model. They have questioned the uniqueness of our own experience in the light of evidence for earlier 'information revolutions'. At the same time the understanding of information and knowledge as commodities, tools or social goods whose transmission is central to social production and reproduction, and the associated concepts of information networks, systems and regimes, have been adopted in historical studies whose objects range from material culture to imperial governance. The underlying questions of who gets to know what, and how, and how this affects the way life is lived, remain pressing ones for both economic theory and historical explanation.

The gender politics of information and knowledge constitute a common theme of the workshop. Topics include early-modern credit networks, 19<sup>th</sup> century wealth transmission, women in the academic knowledge community, finding one's way in the modern city, rumour and survival in World War II, information technologies and political participation in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the social making of digital computing and the internet as a source of lay medical knowledge.

continued ...

Speakers include: Alison Adam/Helen Richardson (Salford), Jon Agar (Manchester/London), David Green (London), Flis Henwood/Sally Wyatt/Angie Hart (Brighton), Claire Jones (Liverpool), Sandra Mols (Manchester), Adelheid von Saldern (Hannover), Judith Spicksley (Hull), Penny Summerfield (Manchester)

The workshop will begin with a roundtable discussion on the evening of 7 November, and conclude at 4.15 p.m. on 8 November.

Further information is available from: Dr Eve Rosenhaft, School of Modern Languages, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZR. E-mail: dan85@liv.ac.uk  
Website: [www.ehs.org.uk/society/women.asp](http://www.ehs.org.uk/society/women.asp)



## **EUROPEAN GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR TRAINING IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORICAL RESEARCH THE 2003/4 ADVANCED SEMINAR PROGRAMME**

The 2003/4 advanced seminar programme is as follows:

8-13 November 2003 • Tampere, Finland

Organiser: Professor Riitta Hjerpe (Helsinki)

*Research Design Course*

12-16 November 2003 • Tampere, Finland

Organiser: Professor Marjatta Hietala (Tampere)

*Infrastructure, environment and urban culture: industrial and post-industrial societies*

30 March-2 April 2004 • Frankfurt, Germany

Organiser: Professor Helga Schultz (European University Viadrina Frankfurt [0])

*Borders, frontiers and border-regions in history*

5-8 April 2004 • Frankfurt, Germany

Organiser: Professor Helder Adegar Fonseca (Évora)

*Education and social mobility in Europe: historical approaches (18-20th centuries)*

Further information can be found at: [www.kun.nl/ester](http://www.kun.nl/ester)

## URBAN HISTORY GROUP MEETING 1 – 2 APRIL 2004 • ROYAL HOLLOWAY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

### CALL FOR PAPERS

#### *THE NINETEENTH CENTURY SUBURB AND BEYOND*

The early days of urban history writing were marked by a series of key studies of the 19th century residential suburb by Dyos, Reeder, Dave Ward, Kenneth Jackson, Sam Bass Warner and others. Papers which review, revisit, and above all go beyond the agenda which has been set by this literature are invited.

The 2004 Urban History Group meeting seeks to reconsider suburbia and suburban life: its rise, appearance, structure, regulation, culture and households. From carriage and railway suburbs to the vast automobile suburbs of the late twentieth century, this conference will consider the myriad forms of suburbia: speculative, planned, local authority or idealised urban developments. Many of the characteristics of suburbia are currently facing scholarly reassessment. The uniformity, sterility and anonymity, the extent of social segregation and the supposed innate conservatism and lack of community of the suburb are all subject to challenge.

This invitation to reconsider and expand upon the theme of the suburb is required for many reasons. Possible directions include, amongst others:

- 1) To go beyond the older literature and look at working class and industrial suburbs.
- 2) To investigate the degree to which older paradigms of the suburb as an area outside the medieval city walls left a mark upon the 'modern' city.
- 3) To look at specific forms of suburban governance and civil society; it is too often assumed that the suburban municipality was restricted to North America.
- 4) To look at the cultural creation of the suburb – is there an 'imagined suburb'; how was it created and what was its agency?
- 5) How do spatial imaginations and the suburb interact with each other?
- 6) To look at the material fabric of the suburb from tram cars to privet hedges and above all the motor car.
- 7) How should we characterise the politics of the suburb; was it politically progressive (garden suburbs) or deadeningly repressive (read HG Wells, Ann Veronica and George Orwell, almost anywhere) or was the suburb simply reactionary (villa toryism)?
- 8) How should we balance the supposed individualism of the suburb against its collective aspects (the cycling and tennis clubs, the churches and shopping parades)?

continued ...

9) What impact did the suburb have on the creation of 'self' – on the making of family, sexuality, gender, race and nation?

10) Can we see the suburb as essentially 'English'; how was it transferred to other continents; what about the Scots and the Irish; do the French and the Germans have suburbs in the same way?

11) How should we characterise and trace the 20th century development of the suburb in all its forms; in the late 20th century in a world of edge cities, green belts, gentrification, second homes, peripheral 'social' housing estates is the language of the suburb redundant?

Proposals for papers, together with a brief outline should be sent, by 30 November 2003, to: Professor RJ Morris, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Edinburgh, William Robertson Building, George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9JY Scotland. E-mail: rjmorris@ed.ac.uk



## **SOUTHERN LABOUR STUDIES CONFERENCE 22 – 24 APRIL 2004 • BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA CALL FOR PAPERS**

Papers are invited for the 2004 Southern Labour Studies Conference. It will be held in Birmingham, Alabama 22-24 April 2004. The theme of the conference is: Moving Workers: Migration and the South.

Professor Joseph Trotter will be the keynote speaker. There will also be two plenary sessions: one examining contemporary migration into the South and a second plenary will address the historical and interpretive dimensions to migration.

Papers and sessions may be submitted online at the conference website. To submit a proposal through the mail: please include contact information, a 2-page c.v. and a 500 word paper abstract. For entire sessions: please include contact information for the person proposing the session, a 2 page c.v. for each presenter, 500 word abstract for each paper in the session, and include all names and institutional affiliations for presenters, chair and discussant(s).

Further information is available from: Professor Robert Woodrum, Miles College, Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5500 Myron Massey Blvd., Fairfield, Alabama 35064, USA. E-mail: robert@slsc2004.org Website: <http://www.slsc2004.org>

The deadline for submission of papers is: 7 November 2003.

**73<sup>RD</sup> ANGLO-AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF HISTORIANS  
7 – 9 JULY 2004 • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH,  
LONDON  
WEALTH AND POVERTY**

**CALL FOR PAPERS**

The theme of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Anglo-American Conference will be Wealth and Poverty. The conference will aim to cover a long chronological span from the Ancient World to the present day and a wide geographical area. The conference will address a variety of themes, among which might be the following:

- How do people think of wealth and poverty?
- How is wealth justified and condemned?
- Poverty as an ideal.
- Poverty as an evil.
- How have religions influenced ideas of wealth and poverty?
- How is wealth created?
- How is poverty alleviated?
- How have political ideologies influenced wealth and poverty and the relationship between them?
- Should wealth be re-distributed?
- The impact of debt and credit.
- How do issues relating to wealth and poverty differ among different regions of the world and between urban and rural areas?
- How do wealth and poverty affect perceptions of gender?
- How do wealth and poverty affect perception of class?
- How does wealth or poverty affect families?
- How does age affect wealth or poverty?
- How have wealth and poverty been transmitted across the generations?
- How have different societies defined and viewed wealth and poverty?

Either individual paper proposals or panel proposals are welcome. Individual papers should be no more than 20 minutes in length and panels no more than 2 hours. Please send a brief synopsis of your paper or panel proposal, together with a brief c.v. to: Dr Debra Birch, Head of Events and Facilities, Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU. E-mail: Debra.Birch@sas.ac.uk

The deadline for submissions is: 3 November 2003.

## **ECONOMIC & BUSINESS HISTORICAL SOCIETY ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2004**

**22 – 24 APRIL 2004 • ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA**

### **CALL FOR PAPERS**

The Economic & Business Historical Society announces its 29th annual conference at the Anaheim Sheraton Hotel, Anaheim, California, 22-24 April 2004. Composed of some three hundred North American and international members, the Economic & Business Historical Society offers participants an opportunity for continuing intellectual interchange within a modest-sized, collegial, and interdisciplinary group. In keeping with its traditions, the Society welcomes proposals for both individual papers and panel presentations on all aspects of business and economic history. Graduate students are invited to apply and may qualify for reduced registration fees. The Society holds its annual convention in locations of historical significance. Both the annual membership (\$25) and conference registration fees are modest.

Papers presented at the conference may be submitted for publication in the Society's peer-reviewed journal, *Essays in Economic and Business History*, edited by Michael V. Namorato of the University of Mississippi.

Proposals for individual papers should include an abstract of no more than 500 words, a brief c.v., postal and e-mail addresses, and telephone and fax numbers. Panel proposals should also suggest a title and a panel chair. Graduate students and non-academic affiliates are welcome. Submissions imply that at least one author will register for the conference and be present at the time designated in the conference programme.

Proposals may be submitted by email to:

Ken Weiher

Chair

Department of Economics

University of Texas at San Antonio

6900 N. Loop 1604 West

San Antonio

TX 78249

USA

E-mail: [kweiher@utsa.edu](mailto:kweiher@utsa.edu)

Website: <http://www.ebhsoc.org>

The deadline for submission is 15 January 2004.

**ANNUAL CONFERENCE FOR DEVELOPING LEARNING AND  
TEACHING IN HISTORY  
14 – 16 APRIL 2004 • LADY MARGARET HALL, OXFORD  
CALL FOR PAPERS**

Proposals are invited for papers, or the leadership of discussions and workshops, at the sixth Annual Conference for Developing Learning and Teaching in History, to be held at Lady Margaret Hall, University of Oxford, 14-16 April 2004.

The aim of the conference is to provide a national and international forum for the development of History learning and teaching in higher education reviewing current practices, research and innovations, and examining issues of strategic importance. It is intended therefore to be of value to all historians and departments interested in developing their teaching and learning practices, and contributing to the growth and development of the discipline in the years ahead.

Further information is available from Nicky Wilson, E-mail: [n.wilson@bathspa.ac.uk](mailto:n.wilson@bathspa.ac.uk) Website: <http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/events/details.php?id=113&category=history>

The deadline for submissions is: 12 December 2003.



**SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GERMAN CLIOMETRICS  
JUNE 2006 • TUEBINGEN, GERMANY  
CALL FOR PAPERS**

The second international conference on German Cliometrics, organised by Joerg Baten (University of Tuebingen) and Albrecht Ritschl (Humboldt University, Berlin), will take place during June 2006 in Tuebingen, Germany.

The Cliometric History of Germany offers an enormously large number of fascinating topics. The title of this conference indicates that comparative studies are also highly welcome for this meeting. Titles of 'potential' papers are requested at this early stage because the organisers plan to apply for grants to help with speakers' travel costs.

For further information, please contact: Joerg Baten (E-mail: [joerg.baten@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:joerg.baten@uni-tuebingen.de)) – or – Albrecht Ritschl (E-mail: [ritschl@wiwi.hu-berlin.de](mailto:ritschl@wiwi.hu-berlin.de))

The deadline submissions is: 1 November 2003.

---

## **XIVTH INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC HISTORY CONGRESS 21 – 25 AUGUST 2006 • HELSINKI, FINLAND**

### **CALL FOR DISSERTATIONS**

Young scholars are invited to present summaries of their doctoral research at the XIVth Congress of the International Economic History Association (IEHA), which will be held in Helsinki in August 2006.

The XIVth Congress will offer three dissertation prizes: one for dissertations that treat the period before 1800, one for the period 1800-1914, and one for the period 1914-present. To be eligible for these sessions candidates must have been awarded their doctorate or equivalent after 1 January 2001 and not later than 31 December 2004.

Those interested in participating in the dissertation sessions should submit a 10-20 page summary of their dissertation to the Secretary General of the IEHA (address below). The summary should outline the contents, methodology, and historiographical background of the thesis. Moreover, submissions should specify the title of the thesis, the names of the supervisor and jury members, and the institution that awarded the degree. Please do not send the thesis itself.

Submissions (preferably via email) should be sent to: Prof. Dr. Jan Luiten van Zanden, General Secretary, International Economic History Association, c/o IISG, Cruquiusweg 31, 1019 AT Amsterdam, The Netherlands. E-mail: [ieha@iisg.nl](mailto:ieha@iisg.nl)

The deadline for submissions is: 31 December 2004.

---

### **◆ GRANTS AND AWARDS**

---

## **ECONOMIC HISTORY SOCIETY TRAVEL GRANTS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS**

The Economic History Society will consider applications for grants – normally of up to £250 – to assist postgraduate students in United Kingdom colleges and universities with travel expenses incurred in the undertaking of research into any aspect of economic and social history. Applications should be made, supported by a supervisor's statement, to the Administrative Secretary. Information concerning any attempts to obtain matching support from other sources should be submitted.

Applications, which may be submitted at any time, will be considered by the Society's Awards Committee as soon as possible after 1 February and 30 June each year. An application form is available by following the links from the 'Grants, Awards and Prizes' section of the Society's website – [www.ehs.org.uk](http://www.ehs.org.uk) – or from Mrs Maureen Galbraith (whose contact details can be found in the inside back cover of this publication).

## **ECONOMIC HISTORY SOCIETY FACILITY GRANTS FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROJECTS**

The Society will consider applications for small grants, not normally over £150, to assist undergraduate students with expenses incurred in the preparation of economic and social history projects for final degree examinations in United Kingdom colleges and universities. Applications should be made by students, through supervisors, advisers or tutors, to the Administrative Secretary, who can be contacted as indicated on the inside back cover of this publication. The application, and supervisor's statement of support, should clearly indicate how the research relates to economic and/or social history.

Further information may be obtained from the Administrative Secretary. There is no application form. Requests, supported by a supervisor's letter, should indicate the nature and proposed title of the project, the extent of its contribution to final degree classification, and details of anticipated expenditure and of the need for that expenditure. Applications may be submitted at any time.



## **DAN DAVID PRIZE SCHOLARSHIPS 2004**

The Dan David Prize annually awards three prizes of US\$ 1 million each for achievements having an outstanding scientific, technological, cultural or social impact on our world. Each year fields are chosen within the three time dimensions – past, present and future.

Out of the total sum of prizes the Dan David Prize laureates annually donate twenty scholarships of US\$15,000 each to outstanding doctoral students of exceptional promise in the chosen fields. Ten scholarships are awarded to doctoral students at universities throughout the world and ten scholarships are awarded to doctoral students at Tel Aviv University.

The Dan David Prize is granted according to merit, without discrimination based on gender, race, ethnicity, colour, religion, language, nationality, disability, or social or political affiliation.

Further information is available from: Professor Isaac Witz, Director, Dan David Prize, Eitan Berglas Bldg., Room 119, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel. Tel: +972-3-6406615 Fax: +972-3-6406613 E-mail: [ddprize@post.tau.ac.il](mailto:ddprize@post.tau.ac.il) Website: <http://www.dandavidprize.org/>

The deadline for scholarship applications is: 10 January 2004.

## **NATIONAL AWARDS FOR HISTORY TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION, 2003-2004**

The Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology is pleased to invite applications for the annual National Awards for History Teaching in Higher Education. These awards are offered in partnership with the following historical societies and groups: Economic History Society, Historical Association, History at the Universities Defence Group, Royal Historical Society, and the Social History Society.

The aim of the awards is to recognise and reward history teachers who have made an outstanding contribution to the enhancement of history teaching and the support of student learning through innovation, leadership or excellence in national, regional or institutional contexts, and to draw their achievements to the attention of the history community as a whole. Up to five awards, each of £1,000, are available in the academic year 2003-2004.

The awards are open to all full or part-time historians who are currently teaching on history courses in UK institutions of higher education, or history courses on higher education programmes in UK further education institutions. The following historians are not eligible: (i) National Teaching Fellowship award holders (NTFS); (ii) staff working for the Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology (LTSN); (iii) members of the Evaluation Panel for the Awards.

Those wishing to apply should provide an account of their contribution to the enhancement of teaching and learning in History. The following examples are provided for guidance only, they are not intended to be prescriptive: enhancement of teaching and learning through traditional or innovative modes of course design, delivery or assessment; development of departmental strategies or practices in developing the curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment; contribution to disciplinary dialogue and scholarship on teaching and learning through seminars and workshops, supporting colleagues, or publications. Applications should be accompanied by two letters of support from colleagues. Detailed information on application requirements can be found at: <http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/history/awards/naht.php>

Applications should be sent to: Caroline Graham-Brown, Manager of the Subject Centre for History, Classics and Archaeology, University of Glasgow, 1 University Gardens, Glasgow G12 8QQ. E-mail: [cgb@arts.gla.ac.uk](mailto:cgb@arts.gla.ac.uk)

The deadline for applications is: 16 February 2004.

## **BIENNIAL PRIZE FOR YOUNG SCHOLARS WORKING ON EUROPEAN BANKING HISTORY**

The European Association for Banking History will award a prize for an individual scholar, or a team of a maximum of three scholars, working on either an institutional, economic or social aspect of the history of European banking or on a biography of a European banker or a banker's dynasty. The studies should meet academic requirements, be unpublished and consist of 80,000 to 120,000 words. The applicants should not be over the age of 35 when submitting their manuscripts. The text will be accepted in any European language but will have to be accompanied by an abstract of 3,000 words/10 pages in English. The prize of 2,500 EUR will be awarded in Vienna in 2005.

For further details please contact: Ms. Gabriella Massaglia, European Association for Banking History e.V., Sophienstrasse 44, D-60487 Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Tel: +49 69 97 20 33 07 Fax: +49 69 97 20 33 08 E-mail: info@bankinghistory.de

The deadline for submissions is: 30 November 2004.



## **ECONOMIC HISTORY SOCIETY INITIATIVES AND CONFERENCE FUND**

The Economic History Society maintains a fund to encourage otherwise unfunded workshops, special meetings and other interesting initiatives in economic and social history. Activities which might encourage wider participation in the Society, in research (especially by those who are not full-time university academics) or generate research articles for submission to the *Review* may be particularly eligible for support from the Fund. The Society is especially keen to encourage one-day workshops which might provide sessions at the annual conference or articles for the *Review*.

The Society will not make grants from the fund for more than £1,000 (£500 for a one-day workshop). Whatever the sum granted, there must be a specific prominent acknowledgement of the Society's support in any publicity, meeting materials or publications. Any events held with support from the fund must be open equally to all interested economic and social historians. Successful applicants will be encouraged to propose papers or sessions at the Society's annual conference.

Questions concerning the objectives and criteria of the fund should be directed to the Honorary Secretary. Applications, which may be submitted to the Administrative Secretary at any time, will be considered by the Society's Awards Committee as soon as possible after 1 February and 30 June each year. An application form is available by following the links from the 'Grants, Awards and Prizes' section of the Society's website – [www.ehs.org.uk](http://www.ehs.org.uk) – or from Mrs Maureen Galbraith.

## LIVING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

A limited number of copies remain of this collection of essays, published to mark the 75th Anniversary of the Economic History Society. In it more than 100 economic and social historians explain their interest in, and the nature of, their subject. Contributors have written to the general theme of ‘What economic history means to me’ or ‘What economic and social history means to me’.

Most contributors trace their early influences and relate changes in the discipline to their own career path, memories and reflections. Many write of the key relationship between history and economics, particularly what historical study can bring to the discipline of economics. Others praise the broad church nature of the subject, and of the Society, emphasising the place of social history and the relationship between economic and social history and other social sciences. Several contributors write, above all, of the need for economic history to be accessible, appealing and entertaining whilst addressing big moral and social questions.

Like history itself, the essays can be read in many ways. They can be analysed in relation to their theoretical and empirical content; prosopographically, as a (possibly unique?) exercise in the collective biography of a profession; as a series of statements about the state of economic history and its links to other subjects. But, like history, they can also be approached in another way. They can simply be enjoyed, for what they are: stories, reflections and recollections, critical, speculative, entertaining, personal and human. There are Klondike spaces, Damascus roads, love affairs, unintended consequences, paths, patterns, dialogues, lives and livelihoods. We meet parachutists and truffle hunters, ‘big think’ and ‘little think’ types. From Japan to Italy via Australia, France, Spain, Finland, Germany, North America and Great Britain: an intellectual odyssey, encounters with ‘poseurs’, giants, explorers, martyrs, saggar makers’ bottom knockers and other ordinary folk.

*Living Economic and Social History* (Economic History Society, Glasgow, pp. xvi+480, ISBN: 0-9540216-0-6). Price to members of the Economic History Society: £10 (plus £2.50 p&p). Price to other individuals and institutions: £15 (plus £2.50 p&p). NB £2.50 covers postage of up to 5 copies. Trade enquiries welcome. Cheques should be made payable to ‘Economic History Society’. Payment by credit card can be arranged. Orders and enquiries may be sent to Maureen Galbraith, Living Economic and Social History, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Glasgow, 4 University Gardens, Glasgow G12 8QQ. E-mail: ehsocsec@arts.gla.ac.uk

# ECONOMIC HISTORY SOCIETY

(Charity Registration No. 228494)

*President:* PROF. P. HUDSON

*Honorary Vice-Presidents:*

PROF. F.M.L. THOMPSON

PROF. P. MATHIAS

PROF. B.E. SUPPLE

PROF. SIR TONY WRIGLEY

PROF. P.K. O'BRIEN

*Hon. Treasurer:* PROF. M.J. FRENCH

*Hon. Secretary:* PROF. R.H. TRAINOR

*Editors:* PROF. N.F.R. CRAFTS AND DR. R.M. SMITH

*Book Review Editor:* DR. S. HORROCKS

*Chair, Conference Committee:* PROF. A. OFFER

*Chair, IT Committee:* DR. R. MIDDLETON

*Chair, Publications Committee:* PROF. M.W. KIRBY

*Chair, Schools and Colleges Committee:* DR. N. ZAHEDIEH

*Chair, Women's Committee:* PROF. E.A. LAURENCE

## COUNCIL

PROF. R. ALLEN

DR. F. CARNEVALI

PROF. J. CHARTRES

DR. N.B. HARTE

PROF. M.J. HATCHER

DR. D. HIGGINS

DR. K. HONEYMAN

PROF. R.J. MORRIS

DR. C.J. MULDREW

PROF. A. OFFER

PROF. M. OVERTON

PROF. R.G. RODGER

DR. C.R. SCHENK

PROF. P.M. THANE

PROF. J. TOMLINSON

DR. N. VERDON

PROF. M. WALSH

DR. K.E. WATSON

MR. O.M. WESTALL

DR. J. WHITTLE

PROF. C.J. WRIGLEY

DR. B. DOYLE (*co-opted member: nominated by The Social History Society*)

PROF. B.R. TOMLINSON (*co-opted member: Standing Conference Convenor*)

PROF. M. MORGAN (*co-opted member: nominated by The Royal Economic Society*)

## ADDRESSES

- President:** PROFESSOR PAT HUDSON  
HISAR  
Cardiff University  
PO Box 909  
Cardiff CF10 3XU  
Tel: 029 20 876498  
E-mail: hudsonp@cardiff.ac.uk
- Treasurer:** PROFESSOR MIKE FRENCH  
Department of Economic and Social History  
University of Glasgow  
4 University Gardens  
Glasgow G12 8QQ  
Tel: 0141 330 5986  
Fax: 0141 330 4889  
E-mail: m.french@socsci.gla.ac.uk
- Secretary:** PROFESSOR RICK TRAINOR  
Vice Chancellor's Office  
University of Greenwich  
Maritime Greenwich Campus  
Old Royal Naval College  
Park Row, Greenwich  
London SE10 9LS  
Tel: 020 8331 8880  
Fax: 020 8331 9857  
E-mail: vcmail@greenwich.ac.uk
- Administrative Secretary:** MRS MAUREEN GALBRAITH  
Department of Economic and Social History  
University of Glasgow  
4 University Gardens  
Glasgow G12 8QQ  
Tel: 0141 330 4662  
Fax: 0141 330 4889  
E-mail: ehsocsec@arts.gla.ac.uk