Book reviews

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND


This book is a welcome addition to the literature on late medieval Welsh towns and town life. Based on thorough and imaginative engagement with a wide range of sometimes difficult source material, it illuminates several important aspects of the economic and social history of Britain as a whole. Among those who will benefit from its findings are urban historians, legal historians, and historians of women’s work. Convincing challenges are presented to the views of Judith Bennett on the negative economic consequences for women of marriage, and of Bennett and Richard Britnell on the impact of the famine of 1315–18 on the fortunes of brewers. Less likely to be satisfied will be historians of Wales, historians of medieval frontier societies, and historians of ethnicity or race.

The book is a largely unmediated version of the author’s doctoral thesis, and exhibits the strengths and weaknesses common to such enterprises. For the most part it is well written, but words are occasionally omitted from sentences (pp. 9, 48), and not all the data supplied is strictly necessary. (It seems superfluous to supplement the statement (p. 119) that 27 per cent of those named in the court records of Ruthin between 1312 and 1321 were women with the information that 73 per cent were men.) The bibliography is impressive, but given the importance placed by the author on the practices of regrating and forestalling, the omission of Gwen Seabourne’s Royal regulation of loans and sales in medieval England (2003) is surprising. More generally, while the author makes his case with skill and conviction, his approach is at times one-dimensional and lacking in that important element of contextualization that comes when more time for additional reading and thought is allowed between the completion of a Ph.D. and its appearance in print. To give one example, the author mentions more than once the attack on Ruthin by a neighbouring Welsh force in May 1321 (pp. 112–14, 244) but no context for this episode is provided. Presumably it formed part of the conflict that erupted in the Welsh March in that year between Thomas earl of Lancaster and his cousin and long-time enemy, King Edward II, concerning the latter’s willingness to allow his favourites, Hugh Despenser, father and son, to acquire land in the March by fair means or foul. It is nowhere mentioned in the book, but it is important to know that the lord of Ruthin, Roger Grey, was a loyal supporter of the king in this struggle, which in turn suggests that the attack on the town was inspired by allies of Lancaster. (The Grey family is mentioned in the text, but not in the index.)

The central thesis of the book is that it was access to capital, rather than issues of race, that determined the nature of the interaction between the English and the Welsh in Ruthin, and the economic fortunes of the town itself in the century or so after the final English conquest of Wales in the 1270s. This is reminiscent of the ‘Dear Economist’ column in the weekend Financial Times, devoted to ‘resolving readers’ dilemmas with the tools of Adam Smith’, which on a weekly basis demonstrates the absurdity of attempting to explain human behaviour in exclusively economic terms. The author makes a compelling case for seeing access to capital as a crucial factor in understanding fourteenth-century Ruthin, but it is disingenuous to imagine that such access was in some sense race-neutral in this colonial setting. At the very least the ability to speak English would have been a requirement for those Welsh who wished to engage in capital acquisition, yet the author’s
willingness to concede the possibility that ‘the Welsh community was less versed in the “culture of commerce” than its English counterpart’ (p. 248) is not linked to this obvious issue of language. Since the Welsh suffered under no legal discrimination in the town, the existence of a ‘Welsh Street’ at its centre suggests that other cultural determinants, such as language, were alive and well among its inhabitants. The refusal of the town-dwelling Welsh to join their rural brethren in the attack on Ruthin in 1321 is cited by the author as evidence of a lack of ethnic dichotomy of the sort diagnosed by Rees Davies for rural Dyffryn Clwyd and as a sign that within the town ‘social standing was a more potent factor in determining a person’s actions than ethnicity or social background’ (p. 114). Possibly, but might not loyalty to Roger Grey, hatred of Thomas of Lancaster, or fear of future reprisals from English neighbours have been more important? This book can be read with profit, but leaves some significant issues unexplored and questions unanswered.

University of Bristol

BRENDAN SMITH


Benjamin Worsley has received attention from Charles Webster, notably in The great instauration: science, medicine and reform, 1626–1660 (1975), and later in the DNB, but, even so, he remains a shadowy figure. Worsley may not have played a leading role in the political, commercial, or scientific revolutions that transformed England in the mid-seventeenth century but, nonetheless, he did play important supporting parts in all three, which allow Leng’s compact and well-written biography to provide a fascinating insight into the changes and continuities that shaped the era. The biography is unusual in saying little about Worsley’s family and everyday life. Rather it focuses on his career and writings, both published and unpublished, and what they reveal about his inner soul or ‘spirit’ and the secular world within which he pursued both personal and national ‘interest’.

Like most sons of the minor gentry of this period, Worsley started his career with little beyond an apprenticeship premium—in his case the fairly modest sum required by a surgeon—but was able to use his training to take advantage of the opportunities presented by an increasingly commercial, politically centralized, and imperial world. His skills enabled him to obtain state employment as a surgeon with the army in Ireland in the 1640s; to gain access to influential scientific circles (including Samuel Hartlib and Robert Boyle) in London and in Amsterdam; and to secure further government jobs under both the Republican and Restoration regimes. Worsley’s story of geographic and social mobility provides a telling example of how the middling sorts could weather massive change, and better themselves, through making an investment in education and reputation while also fastening themselves to patronage networks in overlapping political, economic, and social worlds.

Readers of this journal will probably find most of interest in the discussion of Worsley’s role in the formulation of commercial policy and the construction of a lasting framework for governing a newly valuable empire. As secretary to the Commonwealth’s council of trade in 1651–2, and author of the Advocate (1651), Worsley was a principle architect of the Navigation Act. Fifteen years later he played an equally important role in formulating Restoration policy with the production and wide circulation of a series of unpublished papers and service to the councils of trade between 1668 and 1673 when his refusal to take the Test ended his career. His legacy was strong and his successor, John Locke, was deeply influenced by his ideas. In looking at Worsley’s interventions over a period of 23 years Leng shows the continuities and coherence in the commercial policy which evolved in a period
of radical regime changes and this, no doubt, helps explain the durability of the seventeenth-century framework for colonial regulation and imperial government. Leng’s account of Worsley’s role in the Restoration government also provides an important corrective to Webster’s story of his commitment to the ‘universal reform’ of the world. Leng shows that in Worsley’s view prosperity united the nation and it was the state’s business to promote the wealth and strength of England rather than to enforce any particular kind of Protestantism. He felt able to serve the state—even a monarchy—so long as it promoted these secular aims and spiritual matters were left to individual conscience, as they largely were between 1668 and 1673. However, the oath required in 1673 was ‘a scruple too far’. This reaffirmation of the goals of the confessional state in defending religious uniformity was unacceptable to Worsley and explains his departure.

Leng’s well-researched and thoughtful account of Worsley’s life is able to connect people and ideas in ways that cut across the conventional chronological and subject divisions, which have reduced understanding of continuity and change in this era of political, commercial, and scientific revolutions. It provides a welcome addition to the historiography.


This book is an important addition to the literature on early modern Scotland and on famines generally. In Scotland the famine of the 1840s—first dubbed the ‘Great Highland Famine’ by Tom Devine in an eponymous study published in 1988—looms much larger than the crisis described by some contemporaries as ‘King William’s dear years’ or the ‘seven ill years’. Perhaps it is not so surprising that a rather poorly documented catastrophe, ignored by one of Scotland’s most famous sons in his account of famine in the *Wealth of nations*, should also be downplayed or marginalized by historians. Cullen, however, makes it abundantly clear that, compared to her more obscure famine of a century and a half earlier, Devine’s ‘great famine’ of 1847 was very minor indeed. Whereas the former crisis claimed relatively few victims, the latter took a significant toll in lives; whereas the former was regional, the latter was national in scale, although subject (like all famines) to regional variation. Indeed, the publication of Cullen’s study opens the way for comparative analysis of these two famines. Most likely, such analysis would highlight the transformation of the Scottish economy between the 1690s and the 1840s.

Cullen’s approach is thematic rather than chronological, and so there are chapters on the famine’s historiography; the weather and harvest shortfalls; the functioning of food markets; the organization of relief; demography; and migration. As with the major Irish famine of 1740–1, surviving documentation on the ‘ill years’ is very patchy. Cullen exploits what demographic and price data remain to the full, but the lack of hard meteorological and crop yield data means that her account of harvest patterns is impressionistic rather than quantitative. By the same token she cannot estimate aggregate relief expenditure or the extent of local migration and emigration. A lack of evidence also precludes much discussion of the tensions and inequalities that, as evidence from other famines makes plain, are limited or hidden in normal times but accentuated or laid bare by famine: families breaking up, farmers firing workers, landlords evicting tenants.

As is often the case with past famines, surviving food price data are much more reliable and representative than agricultural or demographic data. By compiling and exploiting data on the price of oatmeal, the staple food of the time, in a dozen or so markets, Cullen
provides a very useful, non-technical discussion of how grain markets functioned during the famine. Her analysis provides compelling evidence from Adam Smith’s own back yard against his dogmatic assertion that famine stemmed only from ‘the violence of government attempting, by improper means, to remedy the inconveniences of a dearth’. As Cullen shows, government interference did more to free up trade than to restrict it in the 1690s, and her table of ‘Candlemass county oatmeal fairs, 1689–1703’ (p. 59) implies that markets were no less integrated during the famine than before or after it. Curiously, prices did not rise that much in any of the markets listed; the doubling of prices at the peaks in 1696 and 1698 bears comparison with the quintupling of potato prices during the Great Irish Famine, or the quadrupling of rice prices during the Great Bengal famine of 1770. Does this imply that the severity of a famine cannot be inferred from price movements alone?

Chapter 5, which analyses the famine’s impact on vital rates, also rests on mainly quantitative evidence. Building on the pioneering work of the late Michael Flinn and his collaborators (in *Scottish population history from the seventeenth century to the 1930s*, 1978), Cullen produces convincing evidence of a subsistence crisis that left its mark on births, deaths, and marriages across Scotland. Flinn et al. reckoned that the famine had reduced Scottish population by 5 to 15 per cent. Cullen’s data hardly allow more precision. Her canvass of scores of surviving parish registers for data of adequate quality yields a 10-parish sample covering the 1690–1703 period. This allows a comparison of deaths in famine and non-famine years, which implies a cumulative excess mortality of 150 per cent between 1695 and 1699, but such an exercise alone is hardly a conclusive guide to the famine’s severity. One problem is that it is impossible to say how representative are the parish registers selected for analysis; another is the lack of evidence on the non-crisis death rate that would allow us to infer an aggregate death toll. A pre-famine crude death rate of 30 per thousand, for example, would imply an excess mortality rate of about 5 per cent, but this makes no allowance for the (likely?) under-recording of famine deaths. Again, data limitations preclude detailed scrutiny of deaths by age and the causes of death, although Cullen offers interesting insights on the extent of infant and child mortality and on the role of smallpox. Another staple of famine demography, mortality by gender, is not addressed.

Cullen’s discussions of relief and migration are also useful. The Scottish poor law, like that of its southern neighbour, was organized on a parish basis and thereby capitalized on local information, but a drawback of the system was the disproportionate burden that this placed on those parishes least capable of providing relief. For thousands in western and south-western Scotland, emigration to Ulster offered a substitute for relief. Yet as in Ireland in the 1840s, it is unlikely that it offered a remedy to the weakest and the very poorest, those who needed relief most.

The author’s occasional use of Scottishisms not recognized by standard spell-checkers (‘sorning’, p. 162; ‘outwith’, p. 186) may bespeak a monograph targeting a mainly local audience, but *Famine in Scotland* is an excellent study that deserves to be read by all those interested in the history of famine.

*Cormac Ó Gráda*


In 1838, Isaac Taylor wrote in *Home education* (2nd edn, 1838, pp. 56–7) that ‘the notion of HOME is English’, adding that ‘the house of a bachelor may be called his home; nevertheless who ever hears the word without thinking of a family?’ According to Vickery’s
Behind closed doors, the eighteenth-century answer was ‘very few’. Even as the occupants defined the home, however, the home defined its occupants. In a little over 300 pages, Vickery examines this notion. In the process, she elucidates the intersections of home, gender, and economy that were fundamental to notions of identity in Georgian Britain. In doing so, she gives us a glimpse into the hidden terrain of domestic life.

Vickery’s subject in Behind closed doors is the social history of eighteenth-century domestic space. It is the story of Georgians’ lived experiences within their homes and with their things. Certainly, she is not the first to explore the home. The analysis of domesticity, inventories, decorative arts, and architectural history have long preoccupied scholars of women, gender, the family, consumer society, and art and architecture. However, rather than seeing these studies as discreet fields, she seeks to examine them at a point of their convergence, the domestic interior. By doing so, she exposes important intersections in the historiographies of gender, consumption, architecture, and art.

Perhaps the most impressive feature of Vickery’s work is her use of sources. The breadth of her research is vast, coming from 64 different libraries and archives. She supplements conventional historical sources, such as letters, diaries, court records, and novels, with inventories, account books, business ledgers, pattern books, and advertisements. Doing so allows her to move beyond a study of middling families to range from the wealthiest aristocratic households to the lives of London’s poor. In her hands, lists and ledgers are more than sources of quantitative data; they tell the stories of individual lives. Objects and spaces open up the lost world behind the closed doors of Georgian life.

Vickery’s history explains the many ways in which Georgian Britons imagined, engaged with, and were changed by, their domestic spaces. Of central importance was householder status. It brought with it social authority and standing. As the author explains, ‘residential independence was central to social respect and personal autonomy’ during the period (p. 7). No matter what one’s social rank, householder status was a fundamental marker of adulthood. However, householders did not necessarily own their lodgings. In fact, Vickery estimates that 90 per cent of houses were rented in Georgian England (p. 7).

The control of boundaries was yet another important element of eighteenth-century domestic life. Thresholds, linen closets, rented room, locks, boxes, and keys were at the core of eighteenth-century understandings of authority, property, independence, and privacy. Thus, in 1773, when William Gansel shot at John Hyde, a Sheriff’s Officer attempting to arrest him for debt, he defended himself: ‘I submit it to a Jury of my country, whether I had not a right to defend myself in my own house? I always understood, and I understand now from the authority of Mr. Justice Blackstone, that the house of an Englishman is his castle; and that a room which a man hires for a certain time is his house’ (Old Bailey Proceedings Online <www.oldbaileyonline.org>, 8 September 1773, trial of William Gansel, t17730908-200).

Gender defined the Georgian home. Bachelors pined for the comforts of married domesticity, which was based on notions of patriarchal hierarchy. Nevertheless, the family household was generally defined through both expectations of cooperation and daily negotiations of power between wives and husbands. If a gender hierarchy was assumed, eighteenth-century Britons nevertheless recognized that marriage was a joint venture. Vickery shows how these negotiations were worked out through household consumption. From outfitting a home at the beginning of a marriage through the mundane day-to-day affairs of life, both women and men took an active role in the household economy. This is not to say, however, that they did not have their own domains within the household. Vickery’s analysis of husbands’ and wives’ household account books reveals that men most often handled purchases for the estate and stables and luxury goods. Women controlled the
food, servants, and linen. The decoration of the house was not a frivolous pursuit; it served an important role in the social affairs. Properly outfitting and maintaining rooms symbolized a healthy household—one that was governed by the regimes of ‘taste’, social status, and economy. Spousal cooperation in doing so contributed to marital bliss and the respect of their community. Of course, not every household was a model of perfection, and Vickery outlines the ‘trials of domestic dependence’ of both wives and unmarried women.

Vickery’s *Behind closed doors* once again displays the expert scholarship, interpretive nuance, and deft writing that makes her work a pleasure to read. Its successful blending of historiographies expands not only what we know, but how we think about the eighteenth-century household. *Behind closed doors* is essential reading for eighteenth-century specialists as well as scholars of gender, consumption, and architecture.

**Indiana University**

JASON M. KELLY


Nineteenth-century women engaged in a greater range of business activities than previously thought. Recent studies by Nicola Phillips (*Women in business, 1700–1850*, 2006) and Hannah Barker (*The business of women: female enterprise and urban development in northern England, 1760–1830*, 2006) reveal a growing number of businesswomen in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Kay’s new book adds fuel to this fire, with a sustained and detailed analysis of female-led business activities between 1800 and 1870. In demonstrating the extent of women’s business, the book adds to a growing story that many women lived out their lives beyond the boundaries of the separate spheres even when domestic ideology was at its height. However, Kay’s intervention is not simply the identification of active businesswomen, but a new definition of the character of entrepreneurship. Women’s business activities, Kay argues, were driven by notions of honour and duty as much as financial necessity. Rather than viewing business proprietorship as driven by the need to secure a maximum profit, Kay contends that for these women entrepreneurship was about ‘striking the delicate balance between revenue and respectability’ (p. 127).

The first chapter situates the research in the much-discussed separate spheres debate, arguing that woman’s proper sphere was not always equated with the domestic. Chapter 2 outlines the factors that promoted and checked women’s engagement in business. While businesswomen’s legal position remained complex, they benefited from the waning influence of the guilds and the development of new forms of consumer industry. Although largely excluded from a growing managerial industry and new civic associations, women often built up business reputations and drew on family and local networks for capital and credit. Through detailed analysis of the Sun Fire Insurance Registers, Kay estimates that around 10 per cent of businesses were run by women in this period. Women’s businesses were comparatively well capitalized, although excluded from the higher levels of capitalization enjoyed by some businesses run by men. The insurance registers, in combination with trade cards, reveal the range of female business activities. Women were often involved in activities related to needlework and there was a strong association between women and domestic provisioning. However, women engaged in these trades on many different levels. There was a gulf between the upmarket draper and lowly haberdasher, and between the grocer and humble chandler selling out of a single ground floor room or basement. Women were also prominent in the production of furniture and upholstery, printing, publishing, and engraving. Although women were less likely than men to be merchants, factors or brokers, Kay finds that they could and sometimes did assume these roles.
For businesswomen the boundaries of home and work were often blurred. By linking insurance records with census returns, Kay shows female business proprietors in the context of their wider households. Businesswomen were not necessarily widows or temporary incumbents, holding the reins for their sons. A particularly interesting finding is the late age at which many women operated various kinds of businesses. The percentage of Sun Fire proprietors with small children also suggests that running a business was attractive to lone mothers. Using the insurance registers Kay identifies women who owned property and rented it out, finding that women had a slightly greater propensity to invest in property than men but that it was not always handed over to male managers, as has sometimes been suggested. Women also often ran boarding and lodging houses. Kay argues that these economic activities have often been overlooked, due to their association with domesticity.

Kay’s new book greatly enhances our understanding of female entrepreneurship in the nineteenth century. It is well written, strongly argued, and meticulously researched. While focused on London, it should sit well with existing studies of industrial change in the north. Chapter 7 usefully situates the book in the context of wider geographical studies and contemporary theories of gender and entrepreneurship. While there are similarities between the experiences of businesswomen in nineteenth-century Britain and Europe (and indeed, with their twenty-first-century counterparts), Kay argues that to construct a single model of the female entrepreneur is reductionist. The entrepreneur has often been defined as an extreme innovator or industrialist, but as Kay argues ordinary businesswomen also made an important contribution to the industrial revolution. While Kay offers a convincing characterization of nineteenth-century female entrepreneurship, this could have been strengthened by a more sustained analysis of the way this was framed by contemporary culture. Some novels are discussed, and (in the final chapter) there is a brief mention of advice literature for entrepreneurial women, which could have been subjected to further and deeper consideration. However, given the quality of the quantitative analysis and the space this takes up, it is perhaps unfair to take issue with this, in what is otherwise an excellent study.

Royal Holloway University of London

JANE HAMLETT


Smitley explores Scottish middle-class women’s engagement in Liberal politics, temperance reform, and suffrage campaigns, and she provides a fascinating account of the overlap between these different forms of female association and activism. The study focuses principally on Edinburgh and Glasgow and is a very welcome addition to the existing literature, especially in so far as the experience in Scotland was different from that in England. Smitley gives a detailed account of the differences in women’s entitlement to vote and to stand for office in municipal elections, and she shows how the British Women’s Temperance Association Scottish Christian Union (BWTASCU) took a pro-suffrage stance, while its sister organization in England sought to distance itself from the demands for women’s suffrage. Smitley’s analysis of Liberal and temperance women’s contribution to suffrage politics is informed by a broad conceptualization of suffrage and a desire to move beyond the militant-constitutional dichotomy, and she provides an excellent analysis of the historical literature on the feminine public sphere. She argues that philanthropy offered a useful training ground for middle-class women and that skills gained in charity work were transferred to temperance reform and helped shape women’s participation in civic life. In this context she examines middle-class women’s attempts to rescue inebriate
women by providing free breakfasts to women discharged from prison, who were then encouraged to move into inebriate homes. These temperance reformers also set up rescue homes for girls and aimed to provide alternative forms of leisure to counter the attraction of the public house. Smitley's discussion of this 'benevolent work' with the poor is nuanced: she emphasizes the passionate Christian faith which motivated these women as well as their 'desire to normalise middle-class feminine values' (p. 60); however, there is little critical discussion of the tensions involved in temperance reform. Thus, the links between child emigration and temperance, including the setting up of the Emigration Home for Glasgow Waifs, are mentioned without further comment.

The support of the BWTASCU for the prohibition of the sale of alcohol partly explains the commitment to women's suffrage, since women needed the vote both for the local veto and to be able to contribute to national politics and influence state legislation, but within the BWTASCU there was also opposition to women's suffrage and to state involvement. Interestingly, a leading anti-suffragist, Lady Griselda Cheape, president of St Andrews BWTASCU, supported moral suasion rather than prohibition. Smitley's account of the heated debates in Scotland and within the international temperance movement is insightful, and the nationalist aspects of the conflict are particularly interesting; nonetheless, the prohibitionist stance of Scottish temperance reformers could be explored and critiqued more fully.

The feminine public sphere that Smitley depicts is somewhat exclusive, so although the network of associations linking Liberalism, temperance, and suffrage reform are made clear, one is left wondering about the other women who shared this sphere and those who were excluded. The book focuses on middle-class women and civic life, so it is not surprising that working-class women receive little attention, but what of those middle-class women who were not supporters of temperance reform or Liberalism, but were also politically and socially active? It would be useful to have some sense of how women of different political or religious persuasions interacted and what civic life was like in the principal cities of Scotland. This requires some discussion of other parties and organizations and an acknowledgement that the feminine public sphere did not exist in isolation.

University of the West of England, Bristol

MOIRA MARTIN


Atkins has been writing this book, he notes in its humorous and revealing preface, since 1971, when he embarked on his doctoral research, and an Atkins article on milk or a related topic, as the bibliography reminds us, has been roughly an annual event since 1979. Liquid materialities, published within Ashgate's Critical Food Studies, represents an important staging post, therefore, in a long scholarly journey, although it should not be seen as a culmination, for three further volumes are promised: on milk and disease; on producing and supplying milk; and on infant feeding.

This book explores milk's compositional material, primarily from a technological perspective, with a particular focus on how it was defined, 'disciplined', and regulated by food and animal scientists, public analysts, and government inspectors and officials. Part I, 'Rematerializing food history', seeks to establish the importance in food historiography of compositional matters. This involves a fairly lengthy and slightly densely written philosophical and theoretical lead-in, on genealogies of knowledge, the evolutionary nature of matter, and the importance of contingency and materiality. Milk was not static, but immensely varied in its physical properties as well as its economic function and cultural meaning. Parts II, 'In search of milk', III, 'Disciplining milk', and IV, 'Impurity and
danger’, explore the manner, contexts, and contingencies in which it was ‘made’ from 1800 to the present date, although the bulk of the narrative and analysis is essentially drawn from Britain—England, really, with occasional appearances by Edinburgh or Glasgow—from the 1870s to the 1930s. This chronological concentration is sensible, capturing the crucial decades of urbanization, agricultural restructuring, public health reform, the impact and importance of regulations established in 1901 on the fat and other solid standards expected in milk, and, in the interwar period, the significance of insights from the science of human nutrition. The book undoubtedly succeeds in the terms established by Atkins, as an extended exploration of milk’s immense compositional complexity and variety, its ‘material fuzziness’. This made milk many things to many people, and the tasks of definition and standardization highly problematic, as the chapters in part II on testing regimes, scientific analytical expertise, and debates about milk qualities and standards, and in part III on ‘moralizing’ and ‘policing’ the subject, amply illustrate. These chapters especially are written with great clarity and reasonable economy.

Atkins writes explicitly that the book is not a work of economic, social, or cultural history of milk. This is unfortunately true for readers of this journal. The effect broadly is that we can see how—scientifically and technologically—milk was defined, but we only partly see why. It seems strange to read about compositional standards and regulation more broadly of an important area of economic activity without invocation of the business and other material interests invested in milk’s production, distribution, sale, and consumption. These interests had a major bearing on the debates that Atkins writes about, with farmers successfully resisting compulsory pasteurization of milk in the 1920s and 1930s, for example, and arguing instead precisely for the system of graded milks—certified free from particular types and levels of animal disease—that prevailed until the Second World War. This confused consumers and did little to advance the safety of the product. Nonetheless, more broadly this book is not without valuable economic and social historical insight. The advance of the scientific analysis of milk in the late nineteenth century is related to the period’s broader technological and engineering emphasis on precision and calibration, assisted by the hardware of knowledge: lactometers, centrifuges, algebraic equations, spectrometers. There was, too, a late nineteenth-century, scientific management element to the labour process of milk analysis, which Atkins highlights, albeit briefly: each sample of milk taken under the 1875 Sale of Food and Drugs Act took roughly 100 minutes to analyse. This is a crucial ‘time and motion’ detail, for there were only 99 public analysts covering the 237 districts in England and Wales in the 1890s, a resource constraint given the large scale of the adulteration problem. Atkins also adds useful if, in the context of his larger narrative, minor details on the role of large dairy combines in debates about compositional standards and scientific research. United Dairies, for example, refused to fund the National Institute for Research in Dairying, based at Reading from 1912, because its ‘clean milk’ remit precluded support for pasteurization, which the combine saw as central to building larger urban confidence and consumption. Perhaps these matters will take a larger place in the work that Atkins promises for the future, notably the book on dairying, production, and distribution.

University of Glasgow

JIM PHILLIPS


This is a welcome biography of Edgeworth. It has taken the author 15 years of his life, and brings much information on Edgeworth together, especially on his ancestry, with special
references to its Catalan and Irish roots. These can be fully studied in no less than nine pages of genealogical tables (pp. xxvi–xxxv), and take up 30 pages of the first chapter, or more than 10 per cent of the text. The birth of Ysidro Francis (the original order of his names), assisted by a glass of brandy for his mother, is lovingly recorded on pp. 31–2, accompanied by a suitable quote from Dante’s *La Divina Commedia* (Paradiso). The remainder of the chapter reviews the education of young Francis at home, at Trinity (Dublin) and at Oxford. By 1853, the eight-year-old Edgeworth was described as ‘very clever both in languages and in Euclid’ (p. 38). He even wrote poetry (quoted pp. 60–1), some of which, unlike that of Marshall, has been preserved. The next three chapters discuss the ‘making of Edgeworth’ (chapter 2), Edgeworth as professor (chapter 3), and Edgeworth, the landed esquire, the editor and voluminous contributor to the *Economic Journal*, and finally, in retirement and death (chapter 4). Fourteen appendices provide further relevant detail, including his publications from 1891 divided into discrete time periods (I to N). There is a complete bibliography and a good index.

The text contains a considerable amount of economics. As in the case of Marshall, Edgeworth’s economics grew out of ethics and philosophical studies, but in a totally different way. Utilitarianism was dominant in the case of Edgeworth. His first book, *New and old methods of ethics*, appeared in 1877; in 1881 he published *Mathematical psychics*, for economists the most famous of his books because of its innovative analytical apparatus. John Creedy’s preface (pp. xii–xviii) discusses this in detail together with other Edgeworth contributions to economic theory. In 1882, Edgeworth’s final book, *Metretike*, presented a method for measuring probability and utility. During the 1880s, Edgeworth also prepared a number of memoranda on measuring price levels for the various commissions on monetary problems established by government at this time. Chapter 3 devotes considerable space to Edgeworth’s contact with foreign economists, particularly Walras and Pareto, but also Pantaleoni and Wickell. In addition, this chapter covers Edgeworth’s role in establishing the British Economic Association (later Royal Economic Society) and his editorship of the *Economic Journal* (initially with Higgs, later with Maynard Keynes, occasionally by himself). Chapter 4 presents his final contributions to economics, which continued to appear until two years before his death. These two chapters together present a summary overview of Edgeworth’s many contributions to economic theory and statistics. To give an indication of his ‘industry’ in publication, Edgeworth contributed 115 entries to the 1890s *Palgrave Dictionary*, and hundreds of book reviews, the variety of which can be sampled in the appendices to this book.

Edgeworth’s many friendships also play a large role in this biography, from early university friendships to friendships with economists. At Oxford he befriended L. L. Price and Bonar; at Hampstead, Jevons and Sully (psychologist); at Dublin, J. K. Ingram and, for the longest period, his friendship until death with Marshall, in whose shadow Edgeworth voluntarily basked. That relationship was not always plain sailing, as summarized in Marshall’s epigram about his friend, preserved by Keynes in his Edgeworth obituary: ‘Francis is a charming fellow, but you must be careful with Ysidro’. Francis presumably was in evidence for Marshall when creating a new Tripos, securing Pigou’s appointment as his successor, as a careful writer on statistics, and as founder of economic societies. Ysidro occasionally quarrelled with Marshall on points of theory. Francis greatly dominated on balance since Edgeworth was Marshall’s unqualified admirer for the whole of his life as economist. These Edgeworth friendships are well known. Other friends, like Sully, recorded his ‘many-sidedness of mind [which refused] to be under two categories’ (p. 80). Friendships mentioned by Barbé include a fascinating account of Edgeworth’s short-lived attempt to woo the very attractive Beatrix Potter (pp. 133–5). Other interesting anecdotes include Cannan’s exhortation to Bowley on a Section F (Economics) organized bicycle ride, ‘Put on the pace, Bowley, he can’t talk mathematics at more than 12 miles an hour’ (p. 204). Altogether, this book provides a comprehensive portrait of Edgeworth, his life, his
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work, his friendships, his ancestry. My one regret is that it is rather light on illustrations: the reader has to make do with one ancestral portrait, and Edgeworth portraits at about 35, at 50, in uniform at 71, and finally, one at 80.

University of Sydney

PETER GROENEWEGEN


*Churchill’s children* is a narrative history of the Second World War from the early hours of 1 September 1939 when an official government scheme moved 1,473,000 children and adults from Britain’s urban centres. Welshman reminds us that the decision to evacuate children, mothers of young children, and vulnerable citizens was made even before the outbreak of war as officials contemplated the devastating potential of sustained aerial bombing on overcrowded cities. Operation Pied Piper, as the scheme was named, received considerable attention from contemporaries, as did the negative reactions of the rural community housing urban evacuees. Adoptive families dealt with the problems of bed-wetting, lice, and city accents, while the evacuees coped with separation from their families, strange food, and sometimes physical or emotional abuse.

Although there were contemporary studies of the official evacuation policy and wartime memoirs have revealed personal reactions to key events of the war, *Churchill’s children* combines both official sources and personal memories to explore the experience of war through the eyes of the children and adults who were there at the time. Evacuation was a multi-layered experience. To peel back those layers and come to a better understanding of those experiences, Welshman places the stories of individual evacuees alongside those of Billeting Officers, the authors of social surveys, teachers, and civil servants in Whitehall.

Many studies of the aerial bombing of Britain’s cities, the Blitz, focus on London. As the nation’s capital and largest city, London received a large quantity of bombs, but so did cities, towns, and ports in other areas of Britain. Welshman acknowledges this by highlighting the experience of provincial towns throughout England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. To understand evacuation as a national event, the sources for *Churchill’s children* include published autobiographies, unpublished autobiographies, personal accounts that are autobiographical but not part of an autobiography as such, committee minutes, and private papers and letters from contemporaries throughout the British Isles. The sources are written accounts rather than oral interviews although, as the author tells readers, the response to his advertisement in newspapers was overwhelming as the generation of war children remembered their evacuation experience.

There are silences in the current scholarly literature on evacuation. While the voices of officials and adoptive families figure largely in contemporary records and studies, we know very little about the feelings and experiences of the parents of evacuees. How, for example, did parents feel about entrusting their children to state officials and unknown adoptive families? We know little because their voices have largely been lost. So too have the voices of the Jewish children exiled from continental Europe, orphaned or abandoned in Britain, having to learn a new language and new customs. Or indeed the teachers charged with establishing schools for the children that incorporated quality education and cultural and religious Judaism. These are some of the voices that Welshman recovers in this study.

*Churchill’s children* is a chronological study and follows evacuated children and adults from the outbreak of war to peacetime. Unlike other scholarly literature on evacuation policy, Welshman also explores the problems some evacuees had settling back into their former urban lifestyle after months in the countryside. This study also suggests, unlike
those focused on problematic relationships, that the bonds forged between evacuees and adoptive families sometimes lasted a lifetime. In some cases, adoptive parents named evacuees as heirs to their estates.

When using memoirs and autobiographies, Welshman is conscious of the fact that memory is complex and unreliable at times as recollected memories of childhood are not necessarily sequential or time related. Memories of significant events tend rather to be vivid representations of a moment in time. Nevertheless, what Welshman achieves is quite remarkable. Autobiographic narratives complement single memories that then balance official records. The result is a highly readable and fascinating study that will resonate strongly with Britain’s wartime generation, especially those who experienced evacuation at first hand.

The lack of the usual scholarly apparatus in Churchill’s children may create difficulties for those wedded to numbered footnotes or endnotes. While Welshman clearly identifies his sources in a way that is not intrusive for the reader of popular histories, it may be frustrating for scholars. Nevertheless, this study makes a significant contribution to the literature on wartime child evacuation. By situating the accounts of adults and children side by side, a multi-faceted picture of evacuation emerges where different voices and standpoints complement each other rather than compete for attention. We hear the voices of those so often unheard as loudly as the voices of officials and the children themselves. What we understand from Churchill’s children is that war was experienced differently by diverse groups and individuals. This study reminds us that there are still wartime voices to recover and that there is no one experience of war or of evacuation that tells the entire story.

Northern Illinois University

SANDRA TRUDGEN DAWSON


This fascinating book offers a new perspective on the politics of the postwar ‘affluent society’ through the lens of consumerist and cultural movements. Taking the end of rationing as his chronological starting point, Black eschews ‘political historians’ predilection for party’ (p. 46)—which he perhaps exaggerates—in favour of a wonderful series of case studies or, as he puts it, ‘core samples’. The first of these deals with the Consumer Association (CA), publisher of Which? magazine. Founded in 1957, the CA’s product-testing activities were perceived by some business leaders as a threat. The lobby group Aims for Industry read the movement’s egalitarian objectives and desire to promote active consumerism as ‘practical anti-capitalism’ (p. 20). As a social movement, the CA never lived up to the radical hopes of its founders, remaining resolutely dominated by the middle class. The group had more than a few ideological foibles. For example, in spite of its anti-advertising bent, it spent heavily on advertising itself.

Similar tensions were present within the Co-operative movement, the group Black turns to next. By the 1950s, the once-thriving Co-op empire was not actually moribund but was certainly in trouble. The modern publicity techniques necessary for its revival seemed to clash with its ethical ideals. As with the CA, this did not preclude a big advertising spend in practice, and Black suggests that Co-op modernization was ‘half-hearted or flawed as much as resisted’ (p. 59). Nor was there much love lost between the Co-op and the CA, each seeing the other as neglecting opportunities to promote a genuine model of consumer-citizenship. Meanwhile, there was a tendency by Co-operators to view plans for Co-op modernization with suspicion, as the analogue of what revisionists were simultaneously attempting to do to the Labour Party—that is to say, water down its working-class appeal.
Black then turns to the other end of the political spectrum, by examining the Young Conservatives (YCs). That the YCs were more middle-class marriage bureau than political storm-force is of course well known, but there are many illuminating insights and anecdotes here. Perhaps the most mind-boggling of the latter—in competition with the phenomenon of Keith Joseph as judge of a YC beauty contest—is the revelation that in 1967 the Chelsea YCs followed a talk by Quentin Hogg with a performance by Vivian Stanshall’s Bonzo Dog (Doo Dah) Band. History does not record how this combination of Hogg and Dog was received by the audience, but the episode speaks of the contradictions between conservative ideological instincts of Tory activists (if the average YC can be so described) and the ways in which they actually engaged with the modern world. These tensions can also be seen in Mary Whitehouse’s National Viewers and Listeners Association (NVALA) which is the subject of chapter 5. Launched in 1964 as the ‘Clean up TV campaign’, Black notes perceptively that in many ways the group went with the flow of the 1960s rather than against it. Whitehouse saw the NVALA as ‘a consumer movement’; viewers had the right to protest against perceived obscenity and irreligion ‘because we pay for the [TV] licences’ (p. 110). (Did this mean that licence-payers who wanted obscenity had the right to demand it?) In Black’s words, moreover, although the NVALA ‘valued deference’ it was ‘decidedly un-deferential in going about restoring it’ (p. 128); Whitehouse’s abrasive tactics kept her outside the Conservative mainstream.

Another outsider, with a radically different agenda, was the playwright Arnold Wesker, whose Centre 42 project, based at London’s pioneering Roundhouse arts centre, is the subject of another splendid chapter. This shows how ‘Without secure funding or cultural roots, C42 and its property [the Roundhouse] were overrun by pop and counter-cultural activities, far from the blend of high and authentic-folk-proletarian culture Wesker envisaged’ (p. 155). Wesker may not have been as hostile to the idea of naked people painting themselves in jelly as Whitehouse would have been, but all the same, as the Daily Mail observed, it was not quite what he had had in mind. The book’s final chapter, on communication and representations of politics, brings the story neatly full circle with a description of the That Was The Week That Was sketch on the consumer-testing of different faiths. This satirized the CA as much as it did religion, but of course it was not subscribers to Which? who wrote in to complain.

The book succeeds admirably in its aim of providing a ‘socio-cultural history of politics’ (p. 206) although some readers may be less convinced by its claim to have shown ‘politics’ comparative independence from socio-economic forces’ (p. 212). It is rare among academic works in providing entertainment as well as intellectual stimulation. It is a major contribution to the history of British postwar culture and deserves to find many readers.

University of Exeter

RICHARD TOYE


The historical context of this volume is the contrast between the rise of anti-Keynesian economic theory in the last three decades of the twentieth century, and the measures taken to stabilize economies after the collapse first of the dotcom boom in 2000 and then of the banking sector in 2008. The editors have gathered a rich cornucopia of essays explaining how the predominant belief among economists in the 1990s that macroeconomic policy was ineffective was overtaken by events, and ways in which Keynes’ ideas are relevant
today. Rational expectations theory did not provide the answers that policymakers urgently needed in the twenty-first century. Governments resorted to budget deficits and central banks looked first to interest rates and then to quantitative easing to offset market failure. It is a good time to reflect on our understanding of how capitalist economies work.

The opening section of the book focuses on the re-emergence of macroeconomic policy. Bateman provides trenchant criticism of American anti-Keynesians: monetarists for being slow to recognize the instability of the velocity of money; Buchanan and Wagner for their straw-man approach to Keynes; and New Classicals for their claim that the behaviour of rational, well-informed agents made it impossible for demand management to stabilize the economy. On the other hand, Yoshiyasu Ono shows that in Japan’s 20-year stagnation the multiplier effect of loan-financed government expenditure has been much smaller than the Keynesian model suggests. Hans-Michael Trautwein relates European macroeconomic policy since the late 1980s to Keynes’s ideas, and shows why fiscal and monetary rules alone were not enough to maintain stability.

The second section examines how contemporary economic theory deals with, or ignores, themes that Keynes believed were central to understanding how the economy works. Richard Arena shows how the ‘new’ Keynesian-Neoclassical Synthesis is not based on Keynes’ conception of cognitive rationality, with its stress on the impact of ignorance for short-term analysis. Robert Dimand considers Tobin’s Keynesianism from the point of view of the economic system not being self-adjusting after a large negative demand shock. Mauro Boianovsky and Trautwein compare old Wicksellians (among whom they include Keynes) and the new Neoclassical Synthesis to show the latter’s limitations.

In the third section five historians of economic thought comment on the state of scholarship of Keynes’ life and work. Roger Backhouse agrees with O’Donnell that the widely held view that Keynes was opposed to the use of mathematics in economics is wrong, and demonstrates that the argument of the *General theory* was mathematical in nature and relied on abstract mathematical concepts. Hiroshi Yoshikawa uses the language of statistical physics to express the famous Keynesian conclusion that there is no tendency for a capitalist system to come to rest at full employment. Toshiaki Hirai draws upon his meticulous research into Keynes’ theoretical development to make the point that Keynes’ way of thinking offers a more fruitful approach to analysing the real economy than the methods of New Classical economists. Heinz Kurz examines Sraffa’s criticism of Keynes, and agrees that the latter was only partially successful in freeing himself from habitual modes of thought in the *General theory*. Giles Dostaler reflects on the relationship between Keynes’ economic theory and his politics and philosophy.

A final section offers interpretations of the international dimension of Keynes’ work in relation to the current global crisis. Marcello de Cecco draws attention to how Keynes anticipated the logic of events in 2008. Jan Kregel comments that policymakers returned to a form of Keynesianism in 2008 without understanding Keynes’ theory. Anna Carabelli and Mario Cedrini investigate ways in which Keynes’ ideas on how to deal with Britain’s predicament in 1945 might help the world to achieve an orderly unwinding of current imbalances between nations with export surpluses and those (notably the US) that have become accustomed to live beyond their means.

Inevitably, given the range of contributions, the volume is somewhat kaleidoscopic in nature. However, there are rich insights in individual essays, and the editors’ broad point that capitalist economies require active macroeconomic management is amply demonstrated.

*University of Stirling*  

G. C. PEDEN

How far was the form of medieval towns conditioned by practical functions, whether economic, military, or political, and how far by religious and symbolic considerations? Strong claims for the latter interpretation are made by Lilley in this clearly written and handsomely illustrated book. The argument is wide ranging, drawing material from the Bible, cosmology, political philosophy, learned and practical geometry, depictions, maps and reconstructions of street layouts, and Corpus Christi processions and performances.

Lilley starts at the centre of the medieval world: Jerusalem was regarded as the ‘symbolic centre of the world’ (p. 15), and was depicted as either square (on biblical authority) or (more commonly it seems) as a circle of walls, with gates indicating the four corners of the world, and main streets forming a cross. This latter configuration Lilley then finds in depictions and descriptions of medieval towns, while he also presents images of the earth as either circular or square, or combining square and circle. Ideal and real cities thus shared a ‘sacred geometry’ with the cosmos (p. 35). Ground plans of numerous actual towns were also based on the square, showing the same combination of main roads in a cross-shape, rectilinear streets, and quadrilateral blocks. The geometry of some later towns becomes stricter, more precise, displaying proportion as well as symmetry, and using particular ratios for building plots and street blocks: for Lilley, this was more than was needed for any practical function, and is therefore related more to changes in the use of geometry and to cosmologically-derived aesthetics. Meanwhile, analogies between founding a town and creating the world are to be found in the Bible, in neo-platonist texts and in Aquinas (drawing on Aristotle); God the Creator is depicted as an architect; and those who designed towns were trained in geometry, as architects were. Geometrical texts of the period, whether ‘practical’ or ‘theoretical’, connected geometry to cosmology: Euclidean geometry had been ‘embedded . . . in a tradition of Christian cosmological thought’ by Boethius, and practical geometry drew on a body of Roman surveying manuals that indicated the cosmological significance for the Romans of the cross of main roads (p. 120).

Moving from geometry to biology, Lilley finds that the metaphor of the body, and particularly of Christ’s body, is frequently used by medieval commentators, whether describing their cities and their ceremonies, or criticizing their sinfulness. Ruling groups positioned themselves as intermediaries between city and Christ and sought through urban laws to recreate ‘in the earthly city the same order and hierarchy’ as in the city of God (p. 139), proceeding on a principle of moral topography to divide and allocate the urban population. Finally, in Corpus Christi processions, the route taken encompassed the whole city, defining centre and edge (in just the same way as Christ is depicted in some *mappaemundi*), while the associated pageants and plays inserted cosmic time and space into the actual urban fabric.

This is a learned and stimulating statement that combines original research with current scholarship. However, there are some difficulties in the adequacy of the evidence, the coherence of the argument, and the geographical coverage. Looking for representations of real cities with circular walls and square-set streets, Lilley finds only four visual examples and two textual ones, while his attempt to enlist urban seals to this argument (they were circular!) is not altogether convincing. The discussion of town plans is actually restricted to new towns: Alfredian *burhs*, southern French *bastides*, and new foundations in Tuscany and east-central Europe (even though Lilley sometimes implies that his finding holds true of medieval towns generally). This means that the major urban areas of Europe—the Low Countries and Italy—are rather under-represented throughout this study: though Florence appears as a creator of new towns, and Bruges as stage for a procession, a major focus is
England (perhaps a more weakly urbanized country), which contributes early medieval burhs, a high medieval description (Chester), and late medieval town records and processions (London, Bristol, York, Beverley). Lilley does himself acknowledge one problem: if Jerusalem was a model, why are there almost no real towns with a circular plan? Lilley’s answer is to argue that at the time when most new towns were created—in the twelfth/thirteenth centuries—there was ‘a move’ towards showing Jerusalem as square (p. 53), but his earlier examples of this ‘move’ (pp. 16, 20) had been presented as exceptions to the general pattern of a circular representation of Jerusalem. The evidence pointing to cathedral architects being employed to design towns is also notably thin: one unspecific illustration, the implication of two comments in works of geometry, the presence of architects on Florentine supervisory committees, and the discovery in street layouts of ratios also found in the design of cathedral pinnacles (though the earlier examples of this had been few in number, p. 68).

Roehampton University

TREVOR DEAN


Gregg’s study of Röpke is an honest and not infrequently critical account of an economist who belonged to the quirky and—outside Germany—virtually unknown group of ‘ordo-liberals’ that was most active in the period between the end of the First World War and the early 1960s, this a cauldron of intellectual reappraisal that generated a number of new approaches to macroeconomic policy in the countries of the developed capitalist world. Were it not for the fact that Germany’s ‘social market’ model, popularized by Ludwig Erhard in West Germany, had initially drawn strongly on the work of ordo-liberals like Walter Eucken and Röpke, this particularly German variant of economic liberalism might have remained even more obscure than it is today. A study of this kind is nevertheless valuable, not because it reveals any undiscovered universal truths about economic life, for German ordo-liberalism is arguably characterized by staggeringly naïve prescriptions, based on intellectual syllogisms and utopian romanticism. Rather it illustrates the way in which some critical bourgeois thinkers coped with the rapid transformation of Germany’s latecomer political economy and the negative political side-effects of this process for both German society and for international relations in the first half of the twentieth century.

The intellectual prism through which Röpke, along with Franz Böhm, Eucken, Alexander Rüstow, and Erhard, viewed Germany’s political economy, was crucially determined, firstly, by the authoritarian mercantilist character of Germany’s transition to industrial capitalism; and secondly, by the political fragmentation of the bourgeoise caused by the failure of national democratic revolution in 1848–9 and the Bonapartist tactics of the aristocratic state under Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II. The political landscape of both the Wilhelmine empire (1871–1918) and the Weimar Republic (1918–33) reflected this fragmentation with the emergence of some very odd variants of political ‘liberalism’ which included the anti-democratic and protectionist National Liberal Party and social-liberal groupings that were selectively ambivalent towards social and economic liberties and to the role of the state in economic affairs. This fragmentation was also mirrored in Germany’s universities. However, most of the exponents of ‘state sciences’ (Staatswissenschaften), which included political economy, favoured one form of corporatist organized capitalism or another. Before the First World War, the main critics of Germany’s cartelized economy and its abuse of social liberties were to be found in the labour movement rather than among either Reichstag ‘liberal’ deputies or their academic counterparts.

Ordo-liberalism emerged out of the industrialized slaughter of the First World War and involved economists and exponents of state sciences, some of whom toyed briefly with
socialist ideas, but soon rejected socialism as just another variant of collectivism. The ordo-liberal critique of Germany’s political economy in fact took the rejection of collectivist prescriptions and the sanctity of market-determined prices as its points of departure. The abuse of market price mechanisms by monopolies, cartels, and organized interests was seen by ordo-liberals as the fundamental cause of the disfigurement of German capitalism. Anti-monopsonism thus became a consistent feature of the writings of Röpke, Eucken, and Böhm. Along with sound monetary policy, monopoly control was to be the main political pillar of the liberal order which the otherwise non-interventionist state must ensure.

Röpke, in an astonishingly voluminous publishing life, developed a vision of a ‘third way’ between laissez-faire capitalism and collectivist socialism. In a two-pronged strategy, involving ‘deproletarization’ and ‘decentralization’, Röpke envisages a limited but ordering state, a ‘third way’ state of sorts which gave priority to small and medium enterprises, a wide distribution of property and economic decentralization.

Gregg rehearses Röpke’s ‘normative’ political economy with a great deal of attention to detail and with an evident admiration for his dogged defence of the market mechanism and his persistent rejection of Keynesian interventionism. The picture he paints is certainly sufficient to reflect the conservative idealism that underpins Röpke’s thinking, as he swam against a series of orthodox tides: against organized, cartelized capitalism in Germany up to 1945; against macroeconomic demand management in practically all states after the Second World War; and against the Bretton Woods system underpinning the postwar international economic order. It is a picture of a Quixotic but admirable kind of intellectual heroism which intuitively eschews economic power as something dangerous in principle, but without the comfort of a practicable solution. The complete failure of anti-monopolism in Germany’s social market economy must have been a great disappointment to this champion of the artisanal economy of human dimensions. While Gregg identifies several contradictions in Röpke’s political economy, he does not pursue this central paradox of an increasingly concentrated national economy on the one hand, dominated by industrial corporations and big banks, where policy-makers like Erhard could nevertheless continue to claim the intellectual heritage of ordo-liberalism on the other. There is a crucial contrast to be drawn between Röpke, Böhm, and Eucken and their concern for the monopolized abuse of market-pricing, and Hayek and Mises who were essentially indifferent to the problems of economic concentration. This contrast is insufficiently stressed by Gregg.

Gregg is to be applauded, firstly, for providing readers with an opportunity to become acquainted with Röpke and a school of thought that reflected the dilemmas of a dangerously misshapen German political economy in a crucial period of European economic history; and secondly, for revealing directly or indirectly a thinker who falls under the German category of Querdenker, a thinker who questions the intellectual and moral foundations of orthodoxies and keeps critical discourse going, even if their hypotheses and prescriptions were and remain flawed.

Loughborough University

Youssef Cassis and Philip L. Cottrell, with Monika Pohle Fraser and Iain L. Fraser, The world of private banking (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. Pp. xxv + 302. 8 figs. 11 tabs. ISBN 9780859284322 Hbk. £60/$114.95)

Under the assiduous editorship of Cassis and Cottrell, this collection of essays provides the reader with a broad overview of the history of private banking, with the main focus being on nineteenth-century Europe. From the perspective of this reviewer, this collection of essays not only lays out a broad research agenda for the next generation of financial
historians, but it also provides them with insights into the abundant resources located in private banks’ archives. For reasons of space, this review will mainly focus on the chapters that stood out.

Niall Ferguson’s thesis in his chapter on the rise of the Rothschilds is that the family’s distinctive business methods are the ultimate reason for their success. However, he suggests that their success can also be attributed to the system of partnership agreements which were renewed on a decadal basis, and which were strengthened by endogamy. Although Ferguson downplays the role of religion in their success, this reviewer speculates as to whether the deeply-ingrained Jewish concept of the covenant played a role in the nature of the partnership agreement and in the close familial ties that accompanied it. The importance of ethno-religious minorities in the world of private banking, particularly in continental Europe, is a theme that is further developed in other chapters of this volume. For example, Dieter Ziegler’s chapter states that from the earliest stages of industrialization, the majority of private bankers in Germany were Jewish or of Jewish origin; and in 1933, 21 out of 25 private bankers in Germany were Jewish. Ginette Kurgan-van Hentenryk’s chapter, which specifically examines Jewish private banking in Europe, describes their economic functions as well as how they maintained their prominence. She suggests that their success can be partially attributed to their international network reinforced by endogamy and an adherence to the Jewish faith that was based more on clannishness than strict religiosity.

The chapters by Cassis, Cottrell, and Dieter Ziegler have as their theme the challenge to private banking in the late nineteenth century from banks organized on the joint-stock principle. Cassis notes that the arrival of joint-stock banks had a variety of effects across Europe. For example, unlike in France and Germany, English private banks were pushed out of deposit banking, but maintained their dominant position in merchant banking. This theme is picked up in Cottrell’s chapter, which is a tour de force on the organizational changes in the English financial sector arising from the liberalization of incorporation law in the 1850s. Ziegler documents the steady decline of German private banks in the nineteenth century in the face of competition from joint-stock banks. However, he also notes their renaissance in the post-hyperinflation period, and convincingly argues that the demise of these private banks after 1933 was due not to their being outcompeted by the joint-stock banks, but the anti-Semitism of the Third Reich.

Edwin Perkins’s informative chapter on the major Anglo-American private banks in the nineteenth century highlights that in the first half of the century, private banks in the US, unlike their European contemporaries, did not play a major role helping governments raise debt finance; rather, they engaged mainly in merchant finance and investment banking. In the second half of the nineteenth century this had somewhat changed, and the leading houses had moved away from merchant banking, and were instead concentrating on providing investment banking services for governments and large corporations. Interestingly, Perkins notes that the reluctance of some banks (such as Browns) to get involved in investment banking seems to have been due to detrimental experiences during financial panics.

The four chapters on private bank records demonstrate the vast collections held by the archives of these banks. These chapters will be of interest to more than financial historians: art, architectural, business, economic, international, political, and social historians will all find items of interest in these archives. Furthermore, due to the international nature of some of these banks, they are of interest to historians from all over the globe (see particularly Victor Gray and Melanie Aspey’s essay on the Rothschild archive).

Although this volume purports to be a history of private banking from the late eighteenth century to 1914 (p. xvii), the inclusion of several chapters that partially discuss the post-1914 world and David Kynaston’s chapter on London private bankers from 1914 to 1986 suggests that the story of private banking did not stop in 1914. Indeed, the main story
of the twentieth century, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, has been the conversion of private banks into publicly-owned corporations. Although post-1930 archival data may not yet be available, the story and analysis of this transformation would have made this present volume more complete.

Queen’s University Belfast

JOHN D. TURNER


When I was teaching undergraduates in the US, for mild amusement I would sometimes ask my students to rank by country how they perceived European dislike of inflation. It produced some interesting results, but invariably at the top of the list would be Germany and near the bottom, Italy. As a student once remarked, ‘even if perception isn’t everything, it sure is convincing’.

In the introduction to this conference volume, the seventh President of the Bundesbank, Axel Weber, explains why the Germans have been obsessed with inflation. The view of Weber—echoing that of his predecessors—is that Germany has been a successful economy since 1948 because it has safeguarded the stability of the currency. For the Bundesbank the most important lesson it has learnt is that it should bear down hard on inflation. As Weber notes, this is the key legacy that the Bundesbank has passed on to the European Central Bank (ECB). Perhaps it is this legacy which explains why the ECB, an explicitly monetarist central bank and which assigns enormous importance to broad money developments, has remained almost entirely inactive in the face of a collapse in the growth of broad money since the onset of the financial crisis in 2008.

Following Weber, five leading academics pay homage (in varying degrees) to the Bundesbank but their main focus is what experiences and lessons central bankers can draw upon over the past 50 years. David Laidler writes about the successes and failures of monetary policy; Lars Svensson on what economists have learnt about monetary policy; Frederic Mishkin on whether monetary policy will become more of a science; and Olivier Blanchard on monetary policy, labour markets, and fiscal policy. In addition, there are comments on each of the chapters from 11 academics and practitioners. As is to be expected, there is a great deal of collective knowledge imparted by the stellar cast assembled here. However, I am sceptical about precisely what has been learnt by policymakers over the last 50 years.

What is alleged to have been learnt by monetary economists according to Mishkin are nine principles, which include Milton Friedman’s classic dictum that inflation is always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon; that real interest rates need to rise with higher inflation (that is, the Taylor Principle); and that financial frictions play an important role in business cycles. The view of Mishkin, which is probably shared by a large number of monetary economists, is that we now have ‘a set of basic scientific principles derived from theory and empirical evidence that now guide thinking at almost all central banks’ (p. 81). I beg to differ and would point to the onset of the 2008 financial crisis as a classic example of precisely how little we know, and the varieties of quantitative easing as just one example that illustrates how much we can disagree.

Part of the problem is that the real world is more complicated than is allowed for in academic theories. As Jamie Dannhauser, one of my colleagues at Lombard Street Research contends, only in academia do you get theories promulgated that propose standard economic models where there are no banks (credit is provided by perfect capital markets); where there are no credit premia (informational asymmetries do not exist); where there are no liquidity constraints (money is not needed); where perfect asset substitutability exists (investors choose between assets solely on the basis of expected return); and the level of rates does not affect risk taking. All of this is just plain wrong.
Some contributors to this volume seem to share these worries and three concerns in particular are worth emphasizing. First, as Laidler notes, asset price boom and busts are not well understood by economists (arguably because the role of liquidity is not properly understood). Second, Lucas Papademos makes several incisive comments which question the relevance of rational expectations, the efficient markets hypothesis, and the limitations of Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium models. Finally, Charles Goodhart candidly admits that ‘we are all quite muddled and confused about who should do what in the systemic stability arena’ (p. 42). Another fundamental concern that contributors needed to address is why some influential academics assert that monetary policy, financial stability, and debt management policy are independent of each other, when in the real world they are not.

After the events of 2008–9, academics need to reassess thoroughly many of the questionable assumptions that they have made about asset markets and the role that money plays in the economy. Over the last two decades, the focus of macroeconomic research has been on the credit channel and, to be sure, this has expanded our understanding of lending and borrowing behaviour. However, some of the most interesting discussion in this book begins to turn our attention back to a much richer legacy of thought about money’s role in the economy.


Given the importance of notarial records for the social and economic history of early modern European history, there have been relatively few recent studies of the legal and institutional structures that authorized notaries and regulated their activities. Nussdorfer’s key contribution is to provide a complete administrative history of the notariate in the city of Rome between the fourteenth and early eighteenth centuries. Her purpose is not to discuss the source problems associated with the historical use of notarial acts, nor to investigate in detail how notaries actually practiced their craft (or how clients used notaries), but to describe how the institution and the norms governing it developed during the late medieval and early modern periods.

The first of six thematic chapters examines jurists’ opinions about notaries and their writing. It touches on the late medieval distinction between public and private writing, on the perceived reliability of witnesses and documents as judicial evidence, and on the stages of notarial redaction. The next chapter looks at the emergence of notaries as a professional group. During the Avignon papacy, the Roman municipal government developed a judicial system and notariate of its own, but from the fifteenth century onward, the papal administration sought to reassert authority over both. Sixtus V changed the Roman notarial landscape radically in 1586 when he declared that municipal tribunals would only be served by 30 Capitoline notaries whose offices would be venal. In 1612 Paul V gave these notaries the right to bequeath, resign, or sell their offices. Nussdorfer notes that the municipal notaries ‘were drawn inexorably into the papal judicial orbit, joining the notaries of the papal courts in what was becoming de facto, if not de jure, a single state system’ (p. 67). Chapter 3 examines legislation regulating notaries’ production of business and judicial acts, from the municipal statutes of 1363 to the reforms of Paul V. A key element of this regulation was to require new forms of indexing notarial records so that the public could be served more effectively and less expensively. This made it necessary to gather records into archives, a topic covered by Nussdorfer’s fourth chapter. The earliest effort in this direction is dated to 1446; 50 years later Julius II created the Archivio della Curia
Romana; and 55 years after that the municipality created the Archivio Capitolino: none of these initiatives were completely successful. The good fortune of Pope Urban VIII’s Archivio Urbano (1625), which housed both curial and municipal acts, appears linked to notaries’ progressive detachment from the municipality and their dependence on the papacy. Chapter 6 discusses reforms of the notariate under Innocent XI and Clement XI in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This period saw the first collection of notarial inventories, made possible by the fact that owning their offices had made Capitoline notaries ‘more diligent custodians of their patrimony than their pre-1586 predecessors’ (p. 211).

Nussdorfer’s fifth chapter differs from the others in its attention to notarial practice. Here she discusses how notaries worked, how their offices were organized, what their living arrangements were like, how they were able to make a living, and why clients chose particular notaries. In a refreshing case study, she recounts the prosecution of a notary who in 1620 had a copy made of a damaged document in his protocol and then destroyed the original, facing serious criminal consequences. Nussdorfer’s analysis of this case shows that ‘it was not accurate, legally impeccable clauses written by notaries that proved. It was writing set in a specific sequence in a juridically privileged vessel, handled and labeled in authoritative ways’ (pp. 182–3). While the other chapters of the book will undoubtedly appeal to specialists in the history of legal institutions, this chapter was useful in its effective illustration of the dialectic between norm and practice.

On a macro-historical level, Nussdorfer fits the development of the Roman notariate into a narrative about the centralization of papal power, especially between 1550 and 1650. She identifies some contradictions generated by this process and points to tensions between ‘the papacy’s dual goals of profiting from venality and cutting the costs of notarial services’ (p. 146). Other factors (new political theories, a shifting economic context, changes in Roman social life) that might have influenced the development of notarial institutions over time are not described in detail. It would have been interesting to see how venality in early modern Rome differed from venality in other European contexts, or to understand why it was the case that in other ‘places and periods . . . the profession was more exclusive and more powerful than in early modern Rome’ (p. 162). One of the reasons why works like this one are so valuable, though, is that they provide the material necessary for other scholars to make these kinds of synthetic comparisons.

West Virginia University

MATTHEW VESTER


A field once dominated by austere studies of Byzantium’s trimetallic currency, of fiscal and legal categories of peasantry, and of the regulation of the production and sale of some objets de luxe in Constantinople, has broadened in scope, stimulated by editions of Byzantine and western archives and by archaeological research. This work devotes space to parameters, both given (geographical and climatic) and historical (the maintenance and evolution of Roman law, currency, and taxation). It devotes much space to agriculture—the legal conditions of the peasants, of course, but more their viability across legal and fiscal categories, the medieval revival of estates, and agricultural investment and profit; less space (relatively) to traditional concerns such as the state’s financial administration and monetary history; and appropriate space to artisanal production and trade as operations rather than as subjects of complex regulations. It integrates the study of the sixth century, thus facilitating—although not ensuring—analyses of longer-term changes. Finally, it tries to
construct a narrative of outcomes in terms of the economic significance of the state, the rise of estates and tenant farmers at the expense of freeholders, volumes of production and trade, urban prosperity, and later market penetration by westerners.

Morrisson evokes (pp. 25–32) signs of early Byzantine economic prosperity which archaeology has documented; rightly, because the archaeology of early Byzantium stimulated successful challenges to the received pessimism concerning this era. However, by not making clear the complexity of this archaeology students will have difficulty evaluating her many generalizations. Also, *homo faber* is the focus at the expense of social relations. Morrisson addresses next the conundrum of mid-sixth to eighth century economic changes (pp. 38–42), recognizing the archaeological evidence for a severe depression, and alluding to the likely range of factors other than social relations: pathological, climatic, seismic, and invasions and wars. However, there is no admission of the interpretative challenge of the depression’s duration. The ‘explanatory’ contrast with the Black Death’s briefer depressive effect is false, since similar conditions applied in the fourteenth century: climatic downturn, cyclical reprises of plague, wars, insecurity. Morrisson states (p. 43) that the eighth century was ‘characterised by depopulation, de-urbanisation, diminished production and reduced trade’, and partial demonetization, when really only demonetization is problematized (pp. 86–8). Archaeology, her inspiration, needs and deserves to be deployed. The economic *modus operandi* of the Byzantine state is also unclear. As a monetary historian Morrisson has argued elsewhere for a revival of barter, but she does not discuss how this interfaced with the Byzantine treasury (p. 42). Laiou (author of chapters 4–6) envisages some increase of what she calls ‘non-economic exchange’, but she prefers the apparent explanatory value of Byzantine terminology, over archaeological and other indications of significant changes in economic structures in the seventh to ninth centuries. Thus, if someone was still called ‘Kommerkiarios’, he must still have dealt with trade, and luxuries at that. If certain writers spoke of *poleis*, then there were still ‘cities’. If gold coins were minted to pay soldiers’ and officials’ salaries (*in part*), and if tax assessment and collection were *expressed* in the gold *nomisma*, *ergo* everyone paid their taxes in gold coins. Laiou fails to engage with the archaeology and numismatics of the seventh to ninth centuries and is completely ahistorical on the trajectories of towns, artisanal production, trade, and monetization, after the sixth-century economic high noon (p. 241).

The authors do not disagree about the trajectory of the better-documented economic revival, but this too poses descriptive and explanatory challenges. Morrisson introduces numerous possible factors (chapter 3), but avoids synthesis. Laiou, when it suits her (chapter 4), now engages with archaeology, factoring it into her treatment of middle Byzantine artisanal production and trade. Ceramic fine wares therefore illustrate the production and traffic (internal and external) of artisanal goods. However, she overlooks the new story about the re-commercialization of the vastly bigger productions of plain and coarse wares. All told, Laiou is too assertive about trajectories; for example: ‘Urban expansion reached its apex’ in what she calls ‘non-economic exchange’, but she prefers the apparent explanatory value of Byzantine terminology, over archaeological and other indications of significant changes in economic structures in the seventh to ninth centuries. Thus, if someone was still called ‘Kommerkiarios’, he must still have dealt with trade, and luxuries at that. If certain writers spoke of *poleis*, then there were still ‘cities’. If gold coins were minted to pay soldiers’ and officials’ salaries (*in part*), and if tax assessment and collection were *expressed* in the gold *nomisma*, *ergo* everyone paid their taxes in gold coins. Laiou fails to engage with the archaeology and numismatics of the seventh to ninth centuries and is completely ahistorical on the trajectories of towns, artisanal production, trade, and monetization, after the sixth-century economic high noon (p. 241).

The authors do not disagree about the trajectory of the better-documented economic revival, but this too poses descriptive and explanatory challenges. Morrisson introduces numerous possible factors (chapter 3), but avoids synthesis. Laiou, when it suits her (chapter 4), now engages with archaeology, factoring it into her treatment of middle Byzantine artisanal production and trade. Ceramic fine wares therefore illustrate the production and traffic (internal and external) of artisanal goods. However, she overlooks the new story about the re-commercialization of the vastly bigger productions of plain and coarse wares. All told, Laiou is too assertive about trajectories; for example: ‘Urban expansion reached its apex’ in what she calls ‘non-economic exchange’, but she prefers the apparent explanatory value of Byzantine terminology, over archaeological and other indications of significant changes in economic structures in the seventh to ninth centuries. Thus, if someone was still called ‘Kommerkiarios’, he must still have dealt with trade, and luxuries at that. If certain writers spoke of *poleis*, then there were still ‘cities’. If gold coins were minted to pay soldiers’ and officials’ salaries (*in part*), and if tax assessment and collection were *expressed* in the gold *nomisma*, *ergo* everyone paid their taxes in gold coins. Laiou fails to engage with the archaeology and numismatics of the seventh to ninth centuries and is completely ahistorical on the trajectories of towns, artisanal production, trade, and monetization, after the sixth-century economic high noon (p. 241).

The authors do not disagree about the trajectory of the better-documented economic growth, but this too poses descriptive and explanatory challenges. Morrisson introduces numerous possible factors (chapter 3), but avoids synthesis. Laiou, when it suits her (chapter 4), now engages with archaeology, factoring it into her treatment of middle Byzantine artisanal production and trade. Ceramic fine wares therefore illustrate the production and traffic (internal and external) of artisanal goods. However, she overlooks the new story about the re-commercialization of the vastly bigger productions of plain and coarse wares. All told, Laiou is too assertive about trajectories; for example: ‘Urban expansion reached its apex’ in what she calls ‘non-economic exchange’, but she prefers the apparent explanatory value of Byzantine terminology, over archaeological and other indications of significant changes in economic structures in the seventh to ninth centuries. Thus, if someone was still called ‘Kommerkiarios’, he must still have dealt with trade, and luxuries at that. If certain writers spoke of *poleis*, then there were still ‘cities’. If gold coins were minted to pay soldiers’ and officials’ salaries (*in part*), and if tax assessment and collection were *expressed* in the gold *nomisma*, *ergo* everyone paid their taxes in gold coins. Laiou fails to engage with the archaeology and numismatics of the seventh to ninth centuries and is completely ahistorical on the trajectories of towns, artisanal production, trade, and monetization, after the sixth-century economic high noon (p. 241).

The authors do not disagree about the trajectory of the better-documented economic revival, but this too poses descriptive and explanatory challenges. Morrisson introduces numerous possible factors (chapter 3), but avoids synthesis. Laiou, when it suits her (chapter 4), now engages with archaeology, factoring it into her treatment of middle Byzantine artisanal production and trade. Ceramic fine wares therefore illustrate the production and traffic (internal and external) of artisanal goods. However, she overlooks the new story about the re-commercialization of the vastly bigger productions of plain and coarse wares. All told, Laiou is too assertive about trajectories; for example: ‘Urban expansion reached its apex’ in what she calls ‘non-economic exchange’, but she prefers the apparent explanatory value of Byzantine terminology, over archaeological and other indications of significant changes in economic structures in the seventh to ninth centuries. Thus, if someone was still called ‘Kommerkiarios’, he must still have dealt with trade, and luxuries at that. If certain writers spoke of *poleis*, then there were still ‘cities’. If gold coins were minted to pay soldiers’ and officials’ salaries (*in part*), and if tax assessment and collection were *expressed* in the gold *nomisma*, *ergo* everyone paid their taxes in gold coins. Laiou fails to engage with the archaeology and numismatics of the seventh to ninth centuries and is completely ahistorical on the trajectories of towns, artisanal production, trade, and monetization, after the sixth-century economic high noon (p. 241).

In chapter 5 Laiou draws upon the richer documentation of the late Byzantine economy (thirteenth to mid-fifteenth centuries) to elicit evidence of peasants, townsmen, merchants, and bankers who invested and profited. She is perhaps unnecessarily pessimistic about the rural economy in a period when insecurity might be said merely to have fallen to western
European levels (pp. 180–1), and she tries to force the available evidence, including archaeological, to fit her dated vision of late urban decline (p. 200). If the Late Byzantine world did become mainly an exporter of primary products, we should remember that its Ottoman successor, in a similar (but better-documented) situation, long maintained, by value, a trade surplus with the west.

The concluding chapter distinguishes structurally between the Byzantine and western economies, to explain both Byzantium’s early ‘success’ and its later failures. This involves attributing its initial achievement partly to the ‘economic system’ of the seventh to ninth centuries (p. 232); and partly to a vision of Dark Age urban continuity, with significant levels of taxed exchange, and ‘relative monetization of the . . . agrarian economy’ (pp. 240–2): all deeply problematic. However, this is a positively stimulating work whose strengths greatly outweigh its shortcomings (which essentially concern aspects of a mid-sixth- to ninth-century transition around which there is little consensus).

University of Birmingham

ARCHIBALD DUNN


One of the exciting developments in recent Ottoman historiography has been the addition of new insights from important theoretical advancements in economics and other social sciences to rejuvenate and broaden some of the older approaches and the introduction of new ideas and methods for the study of the characteristics and consequences of Ottoman institutions and organizations. Going beyond basic descriptions of what happened to some of the private institutions like business organizations and pious foundations or public institutions like the legal system and state finance, economic historians have variously explored the origins of these institutions, offered explanations of why they prevailed, and identified what consequences they had for long-term performance. Birdal’s book makes a fine contribution to this trend. A product of his doctoral dissertation, *The political economy of Ottoman public debt* undertakes the first comprehensive and systematic analysis of the Ottoman Public Debt Administration (OPDA) and shows the way it provided a stimulus to Ottoman economic development in the late nineteenth century.

To analyse the institutional reforms introduced by the OPDA and their role in the peripheralization of the Ottoman economy, Birdal combines insights from two different strands of thought. Drawing on the concepts developed by the world system/dependency approach that has roots in the imperialism theories of the early twentieth century, he introduces the tools and methods of modern institutional analysis by studying how institutions shaped the actions of the economic and political actors.

The introductory chapter carefully lays out the book’s objectives and intended contributions, the theoretical background that it adopted, and a brief survey of the OPDA. Chapter 2 is devoted to a historical discussion of Ottoman public borrowing prior to the OPDA and circumstances leading to its establishment in 1881. Starting with a brief discussion of restrictions on state revenues and history of attempts at reforming the system, Birdal describes how the Ottoman state borrowed from Galata bankers and external sources during this period. Whereas the Ottoman government managed to meet budget deficits without having to resort to foreign credit prior to 1850s, the cost of the Crimean War forced it to borrow increasingly from abroad and led to various institutional reforms aimed at improving its credit. As the debt escalated out of control and the unproductive use of these funds caused the Empire’s credit to plunge to its lowest levels in the 1870s, the
government eventually found itself having to declare default on interest payments, and a period of controversy and debt settlement ensued that resulted in the establishment of the OPDA.

In Chapter 3, Birdal uses the economic concepts of coordination, commitment, and enforcement to make sense of the OPDA. To identify theoretical issues in sovereign lending and to explain how an institution such as the OPDA could lower the risk premiums and facilitate foreign investment, he uses a simple game theoretical model that formalizes the incentive and information problems in the enforcement of debt contracts. Using the model’s implications, he analyses the evidence to explain how the OPDA served as an instrument for committing credibly to the terms specified in the debt contracts for the protection of foreign investment and why an external authority had to be superimposed to secure financial discipline. Chapter 4 offers an in-depth analysis of the organizational structure of the OPDA and the administration of indirect revenues. It implemented a whole new system of revenue administration that introduced new technologies to some sectors, improved regulations, and modified the rules governing the development of revenues. As a result, not only did the OPDA revenues rise significantly, but the Ottoman economy saw various indirect and unintended benefits, thanks to a range of new institutions that generated various positive externalities for other sectors of the economy. In Chapter 5, Birdal examines the tobacco monopoly farmed out by the OPDA to the Régie Company, the largest corporation and foreign investment in the country formed by a consortium of European banks. The Company’s attempt to raise profits by introducing novel methods in dealing with tobacco cultivators and in monitoring their performance was met with great resistance by cultivators, attempts that some viewed as representative of western imperialism and exploitation. Using original data from first-hand sources, company records, and bondholder reports, Birdal examines the Régie Company’s role in the Ottoman economy. Chapter 6 concludes with a discussion of the OPDA’s role in the transformation of the Ottoman economy.

Birdal’s study is a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the OPDA that should be of interest not just to historians of the Ottoman empire but also to general economic and financial historians. It includes a detailed discussion of the historical background to the OPDA and an in-depth analysis of its organization and administration and its role in the transformation of the Ottoman empire in the nineteenth century.

University of Connecticut


This volume is the outcome of a two-day conference in Trento in 2007. All the advantages and disadvantages of a conference volume are evident in this collection which, relative to the postwar recovery of western Europe, addresses a topic that has been neglected.

After an introduction by the editors, Vera Zamagni’s excellent chapter expounds the importance of institutional systems in a way that could have been the leitmotiv of the entire volume. Ezio Ritrovato discusses the failure of Italian efforts to cope with Mezzogiorno’s backwardness. Andrea Leonardi presents the interesting story of re-launching the Italian banking system. Franz Mathis compares the reconstruction of the Western and Soviet occupation zones in Austria, finding no substantive difference between them. Ernesto Clar and Fernando Collantes discuss the successful restructuring of rural Spain under Franco. Three studies then address the economic problems of postwar communist eastern Europe, including Yugoslavian workers’ self-management after Tito’s split with Stalin (by Ivo
Bícanić) and the failed Polish modernization policy (Aleksander Surdej). The only comparative, strongly quantitative analysis (Peter Csillik and Tamas Tarjan) concludes that the Communist countries attained half of the growth potential achieved by the west. Finally, a group of chapters studies some relatively marginal areas in advanced countries and regions: Maximiliane Rieder on the problems of Bavarian recovery; Boldini on the Italian Alpine region; Cinzia Lorandini on the credit problems of Trentino and South Tyrol; Pietro Cafaro and Locatelli on banking in Lombardy; and Silvio Goglio on the role of local credit in territorial development.

It is not possible here to list the numerous interesting details, especially on banking and credit problems, but I should like to call attention to Rieder’s chapter which analyses the Bavarian development path ‘from an outlying region to one of the most strongly growing economic areas in Germany and Europe’ (p. 282). The role of the Marshall Plan and European Recovery Programme (ERP) are here given due weight, and it is shown how ERP was used as part of an active economic and subsidy policy that focused on the industrial and energy sectors, and defence technology. Unfortunately, other chapters do not give the same attention to the ERP elsewhere, notwithstanding its importance. This weakness is connected with the most disappointing feature of this collection: its lack of organization and consistency of treatment of the country/regional case studies. Firstly, this extends to the concept of ‘periphery’ itself. The editors maintain that an ‘over-precise definition of the concept of periphery’ should be avoided (p.10), but as a consequence we get a conflation of problems of the Mediterranean/central European peripheries with the development problems of marginal regions in advanced areas. In short, the Alpine region of Italy has little in common with Spanish, Yugoslav, or Polish reconstruction and development. Secondly, the volume’s structure is extremely uneven: of the 12 studies, six deal with Italian problems alone and huge peripheral regions are unexamined. Thirdly, the time span is more than controversial. The title signals 1945–60. This is somewhat beyond the standard postwar reconstruction era, but falls short of the classic—from a western European perspective—golden age that extends to 1973. In fact, the terminal date for individual chapters does vary, and some progress into the 1970s. The real problem, however, is not the time span, but the confusion between ‘recovery’ and ‘development’.

The theoretical clarification of recovery or reconstruction is notably absent. Is it, as traditionally handled, the period when the GDP recovered the prewar level of 1938? In this case, reconstruction ended in 1946 in Yugoslavia and in 1948 in Hungary and at the latest in the early 1950s in some western countries. Or is it, as Ferenc Jánossy’s famous theory maintains, that reconstruction ends when GDP attains the long-term trend of growth, thereby catching up on the development foregone during the war years? For Jánossy the re-employment of the already trained labour force and the reconstruction of capacity in the so-called bottleneck sectors, caused by wartime destruction, resulted in an especially rapid reconstruction, but if one accepts this concept the reconstruction period ended only during the 1950s and 1960s. Thus the so-called economic miracles in some countries were generated by unique reconstruction growth.

The lack of clarification of the reconstruction period leads to the confusion of the reconstruction with post-reconstruction economic development. All the three solid studies on the central and east European countries, consequently, also merge the successful postwar reconstruction in the region with the failed modernization development that followed. The Soviet economic model was good for reconstruction (as well as the war economy), but failed as a modernization model. Unfortunately, this differentiation is lacking and the special role of institutions in the two different periods is not discussed well here.

In conclusion, Zamagni’s suggestions about the importance of the institutional setting are not realized with the remainder of this collection. Thus the Marshall Plan is insufficiently covered, as is Bretton Woods and its institutions. The strict financial and other
regulation in postwar regulated market economies—though presented in some of the studies, including those on banking—is also not discussed consistently. Small wonder that Alberto Cova’s concluding remarks are unable to provide a summary of this volume. We learned about various interesting details, but not the real central problems of postwar peripheral recovery, or post-recovery development. The volume, in spite of its rich details on a variety of economic problems, is an unfulfilled promise, an opportunity missed.

UCLA

Derek Keene, Balázs Nagy, and Katalin Szende, Segregation—integration—assimilation: religious and ethnic groups in the medieval towns of central and eastern Europe (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. Pp. xviii + 263. 33 figs. ISBN 9780754664772 Hbk. £60/$114.95)

Starting from definitions of urban space and its features, this volume deals with the assimilation of religious and ethnic groups in the medieval towns of central and eastern Europe. Based on an interdisciplinary workshop convened by Szende and Nagy at the Department of Medieval Studies of the Central European University, Budapest, the volume is edited by two Hungarian scholars and one British scholar (Keene). Integrative through its very nature as it merges different traditions of scholarship, the collection of essays brings together a broad international team. Having a well-defined geographical scope, the studies focus either on a region (present-day Slovenia, Bulgaria, Germany, or Hungary, or a specific area, such as southern Hungary, western Greece, or Livonia), or on a particular town (such as Buda, Visegrád, Dubrovnik, and Lviv).

The volume aims to achieve better understanding of social and political inclusion and exclusion. It focuses on the patterns of segregation and/or integration in the context of the specific features of the region, such as patterns in urban development, the presence of mixed population—as a consequence of migration or trade—and the superimposition of ethnic and occupational differences. The volume assesses the role of religion in fostering segregation (for example, parishes organized along ethnic criteria or links between legal status and religion) or integration (for example, in cases of voluntary or forcible conversion, or even union between Rome and Eastern Churches). The volume engages with identity questions within social and family networks while also addressing issues of authority; for instance, shared authority among ethnic groups, or the segregation of the administration from the subjects as a result of feudal relationships as well as ‘colonial’ perceptions of the ‘other’. Attitudes to religious minorities, and even relations and interactions between various minority groups, are also discussed. The essays are based on an extraordinary variety of sources, legal documents, narrative and literary sources, administrative documents, linguistic evidence (such as place names and proper names), topographical evidence, and, finally, archaeological evidence as well as images.

The volume is dominated by its interdisciplinary approach focused on the study of the urban landscape with the help of archaeology and topography. However, only a few of the studies define concepts or place the research within a theoretical or even methodological framework. Taking into account the representational value of artefacts, several essays use material culture as an indicator of status, while topographical analysis is deployed in order to highlight social differences between ethnic groups. The other major approach is informed by linguistics and, in the case of Szende’s outstanding essay, by historical socio-linguistics. Place names (even street names) and proper names (especially surnames) are used to determine ethnicity. In this sense, quantitative analysis is used to interpret the available data in some of the essays. However, the relationship between identity and urban space remains elusive. Assessing levels of integration or reaching conclusions concerning segregation is more difficult. The authors of the essays deploy various criteria, such as
rights of citizenship, access to positions of authority, and use of language, as a barometer of integration, while degrees of acceptance are often measured in cultural, religious, ethnic, and professional contexts.

The volume benefits from an excellent introduction, which sets the scene in theoretical and methodological terms. The case studies in the volume highlight the fact that ethnic identity played an important role in establishing family relationships and membership of religious and professional communities. The essays are an important contribution to understanding town landscapes, and the transformation of urban settlements over time and under the impact of political changes. The volume highlights the complexity of the processes of segregation and integration by pointing out sometimes surprising divisions within the societies under scrutiny.

Finally, the volume demonstrates convincingly that the use of sociolinguistic methods allows historians to gain deeper insight into communicative, intellectual, and behavioural processes. All authors seem to be interested in terminology and show concern for the sometimes ambiguous nature of the sources. Unsurprisingly, the quality of the analysis varies, but, after a rather slow beginning, the steadfast reader is rewarded by a sharp increase in the strengths of the essays.

Engagement with the themes of the volume is unequal. While this is a somewhat expected occurrence in collections of essays, the fact that the aim of individual articles is not always stated by their authors and that several texts seem to lack conclusions is a less welcome surprise. When essays include a coherent statement of purpose and a thought-provoking conclusion it not only brings the argument together but also highlights connections with the general issues discussed by the volume as a whole. However, most essays provide interesting comparative cases to those of western Europe, albeit at the level of empirical research. They also make a contribution to the growing body of literature available in English about this lesser-known region of Europe.

*Babes-Bolyai University*  
MARI A CRACIUN


Attwood’s latest book provides an overview of the everyday domestic lives of ordinary people in the Soviet Union in relation to their access to housing. Soviet housing is here examined in two parallel and overlapping structures. Firstly, in chronological terms the study covers the whole of the Soviet period, beginning with the legacy of the tsarist empire for the immediate post-revolutionary, new Bolshevik regime and ending with the impact on access to housing of the market-oriented and privatization impulses of Gorbachev’s perestroika initiatives. Secondly, the book takes a thematic approach to the study of housing by introducing readers to the *kommunalka* (communal flat), co-operative developments, hostels, and barracks (often provided by employers to shop-floor workers), and the gradual, though imperfect, development of single-family apartments. The study has a largely urban focus; there is little mention here of dachas and housing provision in the villages and countryside.

Given the longstanding shortage, and noted inadequacy, of housing in the Soviet Union’s major cities and towns, it is not surprising that Soviet citizens assessed their own accommodation in terms of access to ‘living space’, a minimum standard and entitlement to which was measured in square metres and was set down in official policy documents. For most of the Soviet Union’s history, the vast majority of new housing was constructed and distributed under the control of the state, with responsibility often delegated to
industrial enterprises, office bureaucrats, and local authorities, and with private ownership
virtually unheard of. Access to housing was often closely linked to the Soviet system of
internal passports and to employment. It is no surprise, then, that such a study of Soviet
housing rarely employs the term ‘home’, although, as Attwood points out, many Soviet
citizens were familiar with the idiom of the ‘Englishman’s castle’.

Attwood examines housing from a number of different perspectives, not only, as the
book title suggests, from the viewpoint of gender. For the most part, this is a social and
cultural study of housing. Attwood provides insights into how people lived on a daily basis,
drawing her evidence and examples predominantly from reports published in the women’s
magazine Rabotnitsa and the literary-cultural periodical Ogonek. She also draws occasion-
ally on studies published in the specialist architectural and housing journals. These are
used particularly to examine the early, post-revolutionary utopian visions of Soviet town
planners of how the socialist city should be constructed. In this regard, Attwood’s study
also identifies some of the ideological underpinnings of how Soviet citizens were supposed
to live, with the emphasis during the early years of Soviet government in particular on the
benefits of the communal and collective ideals of social organization.

Such ideals were promoted also by the morality tales of the short stories published in the
contemporary mass circulation literatures from which Attwood has also drawn her
examples. The actual and the imagined housing situations are supplemented further in the
book’s final chapter by data gathered from interviews about real-life housing conditions
that Attwood herself has conducted in recent years. It is a shame that these responses are
not more fully integrated into the book’s larger narrative. These individual anecdotes could
add colour to the earlier chapters rather than appearing as an addendum to the study as
they are presented here. The bigger picture could also have been more fully drawn with
some reference to the official statistical data on housing development. As it stands, the
study rather neglects the economics of Soviet housing construction and design, and it
skates over some of the major housing policy initiatives. In this respect, the chapter on the
Khrushchev period, which has provided the focus for much of the recent historical research
on construction, housing policy, and domestic life, could perhaps have been developed
further.

Those with some former knowledge of Soviet housing may find little that is new to them
here. They will already be familiar with the pleasures and pitfalls, as well as the private and
the public aspects of life in the communal apartment. They will be familiar also with the
phenomenon of the ‘walk-through’ room in separate apartments. They will have heard the
countless stories of newlyweds moving in with parents and in-laws, and of divorced couples
forced to remain living together, even in the same room, for lack of access to alternative
accommodation. Attwood adds some flesh to the bones of these stories and her account
remains very readable throughout. More importantly, however, she offers a window on a
forgotten world to those unfamiliar with the minutiae of Soviet domestic arrangements.

University of Gloucestershire

MELANIE ILIC

Michael J. Walsh, Sacred economies: Buddhist monasticism and territoriality in medieval China
9780231148320 Hbk. £34.50/$55)

Sacred economies is a new contribution to the still-slim but growing body of work on
Buddhist monasticism as an institution in the Chinese social and economic landscape. As
such, it joins a series of monographs by Jacques Gernet, Holmes Welch, Timothy Brook,
Kenneth Ch’en, and John Kieschnick that go beyond the usual concentration on doctrinal
history, biographies of great monastics, scripture translations, and the other usual subjects
of interest within religious studies to get at the very material space occupied by monasteries and monks. While this book does represent a modest advance in this field of study, its small size and ambivalence about its main focus limit its contribution.

This book is ambivalent because it tries to be both a documentary history of exchange relations between eminent Buddhist monasteries and wider Chinese society and a theoretical treatise on such relations. This becomes a problem because the main text is only 125 pages long (including illustrations and blank pages at the heads of chapters). If the book had more space for the exposition, perhaps both tasks could have borne more fruit. As it is, neither the theoretical nor the documentary portions of the text accomplish anything beyond providing a tantalizing foretaste of a study yet to be carried through.

The first chapter sets up the study with a very interesting question: how does a monastic institution maintain its existence for over 1,000 years? (p. 3). Certainly, it must be able to mobilize economic resources over the long-term, and the most successful Chinese Buddhist monasteries managed this by acquiring land, and lots of it. Here and elsewhere, Walsh provides documentation to demonstrate that these monasteries owned significant estates, often becoming the largest landholders in their locality. Since much of this land was donated, and since gifts are almost never unconditional, the question occurs: what did the donors get in exchange? The answer is that intangible but very real commodity called ‘merit’, which served to save the donor’s ancestors from bad rebirths and averted disasters (p. 14). At the end of the book Walsh adds another exchange: both monastery and donor acquired prestige from the transaction, the monastery because its worthiness of large gifts was publicly recognized, and the donor because his ability to give large gifts would be memorialized on a large stone stele for all to see (pp. 115–16).

This is the primary point that this book makes. Some of the details that flesh out the book are of interest, such as the introduction to Chinese technical terms relating to monastic landholdings and usage, methods by which monasteries acquired land (p. 84), or the symbolism of the north-south alignment of monastic buildings. Some of the theoretical observations are relevant to the argument, such as the exposition of theories of gift (pp. 16–18). However, some portions of the text set up false expectations, such as when the author states that he will focus primarily on the land economics of the Tiantong Monastery near Ningbo, when in fact the subsequent exposition deals with several monasteries (for instance, the chapter on the Ayuwang Monastery is longer than the one on Tiantong). Other parts of the text introduce theoretical elements that do not advance the argument, such as when the author explains why he prefers the term ‘religiosity’ to ‘religion’, a distinction of no consequence for subsequent sections. Elsewhere, it appears that the author is committing himself to Marx’s labour theory of value (p. 19), a point that many economic historians might find controversial. The author uses it because, as he points out, the commodities that monastics exchange for land, whether merit or prestige, take labour to produce. To provide donors with a substance called ‘merit’ requires the ongoing work of creating a world in which merit both exists and has exchange-value. This and other theoretical points appear aimed mainly at other scholars of religious studies, who in general are not used to thinking of such things as commodities.

The argument is at its best when the author sticks close to his sources and the reader can see documentation of monastery landholdings and the means by which they were acquired, or when quotations from the writings of prominent local citizens afford a glimpse into the ways that Buddhist monks, lay devotees, and disinterested observers attempted to make sense of monastic materiality. In the end, I would say that anyone interested in religious economies of east Asia should read this book, though it seems to me it could have been much better had more time been spent with the documentary sources.

Catholic University of America

Charles B. Jones
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Economic History Review, 64, 1 (2011)

During the last 30 years a growing body of literature has begun to sketch out the patterns of innovation in a number of key nineteenth-century US industries. Drawing on this literature, which includes his own study of innovation in the shoe industry, as well as the prodigious new research that he undertook on this and other industries, Thomson provides us with an impressive study of the structures that supported technological innovation in the pre-Civil War US. These structures are part of what Thomson calls an innovation system consisting of interlinked institutions that ‘communicated and expanded technological knowledge’ and ‘generated and diffused techniques’ (p. 7).

Thomson’s research for this study encompassed over 60 datasets on 14 industries, drawing on an impressive array of sources, including patents and patent assignments, the records of firms and individuals, city and business directories, biographical dictionaries, census data, and government reports. This includes data on over 1,000 inventors and innovators. These sources and his sampling techniques are discussed in the appendices, while tables throughout the text provide his numerical analysis of the data. Just as sampling provides him with statistical analysis, astute samples drawn from these sources also provide examples that illustrate the points he makes in his text.

Thomson begins with a brief account of the most famous invention of the postbellum period: Edison’s electric lighting system. Drawing on the work of myself and others, Thomson sees this innovation as dependent on the existing support structures of the antebellum innovation system, even as it pointed the way to a new system in which large-scale managerial firms, organized research and development, and government-funded and university-based education and science generated new knowledge and techniques. By contrast, the antebellum system relied on partnership firms in which key inventors were often proprietors, machine shops and their skilled machinists, and informal learning gained through experience along with reading in scientific and technical literature. A small but vital sector of scientists and engineers with more advanced education complemented this body of knowledge. The patent system and individuals associated with it played a key role in both eras, but model makers and draftsmen were particularly important earlier.

Thomson begins by exploring the multiple paths through which mechanization entered a number of industries in the period 1790–1835. For example, the development of both textile machinery and steam engines were influenced by developments from abroad, but diffusion took place through networks that linked firms using these technologies to machinists and machinery firms that specialized in their production. Machine makers, who employed highly mobile skilled machinists and sold expensive capital goods to multiple manufacturers, became centres of innovation that were crucial to the transfer of technical knowledge. In contrast, the clock-making industry grew out of local craft practice and an abundance of wood that spurred innovations in woodworking machinery. These innovations spread through producer mobility and patent licensing as well as through the emergence of standardized interchangeable parts manufacturing practices.

Until the mid-1830s, there was relatively little crossover between different industrial networks, which also had distinct geographical distributions. The very process of industrialization created infrastructure that helped breed new innovations. In particular, Thomson points to three key technological centres, each the subject of an individual chapter, that played a major role in providing connections between different industrial networks. These centres both enabled more sustained innovation within existing industries and helped give rise to innovations that created entire new industries.
The machinery sector, which emerged in the era of early industrialization, was one of these. A growing and mobile workforce of skilled machinists was able to adapt technologically convergent metalworking techniques to a wide variety of industries. Knowledge was also created and transmitted by the other two technological centres identified by Thomson, both of which became more prominent after 1835. The first of these was the new patent system created by the 1836 Patent Act. The patent system, which included the Patent Office and its examiners, patent agents and lawyers, model builders and draftsmen, not only provided incentives for invention but also helped to organize and transmit information. The other key technological centre was a growing community of scientists and engineers who created educational institutions, journals and other publications, and professional societies and mechanics institutes that helped to produce and disseminate useful scientific and technical information.

Because Thomson is looking at both the emergence of innovative networks within industries and the ways in which these networks are sustained and brought together through key technological centres, the text is sometimes repetitive. Nonetheless, this is an important work that anyone working on the study of innovation will need to read.

Rutgers University

Paul Israel


Berk has two agenda in this book. One is to trace the rise of regulated competition, with Louis D. Brandeis as its chief theorist and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) as its primary practitioner. The other is to destroy what he believes to be the wrong-headed approach of those he terms ‘historical institutionalists’, a group he defines as including ‘new business and organizational historians, new institutional and economic sociologists, and historical institutionalists in political science’ (p. 3), and their woefully inaccurate portrayal of how the FTC functioned in its early years. Some of this will be familiar to students of the period, but Berk presents some interesting analyses of both Brandeis’s thought and the FTC’s activities. Whether he will convince the institutionalists is another story.

In the 1912 election Woodrow Wilson found himself in a quandary. The Progressive Party candidate, ex-president Theodore Roosevelt, proposed harnessing the power of the big trusts through setting up a countervailing power, big government, to regulate monopolies. Wilson disliked the idea, but saw no alternative to this plan until he met the Boston lawyer and reformer Louis Brandeis, who had been thinking about the trust problem for several years. Brandeis suggested that government should establish rules of fair competition, and then enforce them. This ‘regulated competition’, he believed, would not only check the power of big business, but, by taking away the unfair advantages of monopolies, would expose these gigantic firms as inherently inefficient and unable to compete on a level playing field.

All this, of course, is well known, but Berk’s contribution is showing that Brandeis really meant what he said, and that ‘regulated’ competition required using the national government’s enforcement powers, far more than Wilson imagined. In bills he helped to draft—the Federal Reserve Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, and the 1914 law establishing the Federal Trade Commission—Brandeis helped put in place the machinery that he hoped would in fact create the type of regulated competition he envisioned. In the years following, Brandeis would meet regularly with members of the FTC, often proffering advice. The traditional wisdom regarding the FTC is that poor appointments, a lack of authority,
inefficient administration, and adverse court decisions hampered its mission, so that by the middle of the 1920s it had little power to control business. Students of government organization have, according to Berk, totally misunderstood its workings, and incorrectly portrayed it as ineffecutal. In fact, he claims, the men who headed the agency carried out its mission superbly. Instead of confusion and impotence, the FTC employed what he calls ‘creative syncretism’.

Where others focus on the FTC’s failure to regulate, Berk concentrates on what the agency did to build up the so-called ‘New Competition’. The key to Brandeis’s vision was the existence of powerful, self-policing trade associations that would provide benchmarks and industry information to their members, thus allowing them to compete with each other more effectively. The FTC also worked to eliminate the fallacy of volume production, by which companies measured their success by how much they produced. Both Brandeis and the FTC were champions of cost accounting, and the agency did much, according to Berk, to spread these doctrines. In his one case study, that of commercial printers, Berk shows how a strong trade association sold cost accounting to its members, and how they all benefited from this.

Berk’s monograph will no doubt trigger still one more debate among the various factions that he groups as ‘institutionalists’, a turf war in which I have no interest. I do think that Berk is right in regard to Brandeis’s view that regulated competition required enforcement, a lesson he learnt from his experience in the decade before Wilson took office. However, there are other aspects of Berk’s argument that I find less convincing. He describes cost accounting as a relatively new phenomenon, yet successful industrialists were using it as early as the 1880s. Andrew Carnegie famously said to the managers of his steel mills: ‘Don’t tell me what it sells for; tell me what it costs to make’. While the FTC may have been successful (at least to a degree) in fostering trade associations and trumpeting the benefits of cost account, and while its lack of hierarchical structure may have made it better suited to respond to new situations, the fact remains that it did not, in fact, fulfil the stated goal of enforcing fair competition standards. In an interview with Ray Stannard Baker in the 1920s, Brandeis called the FTC a failure, and said that the appointments made by Wilson were terrible—the same men Berk lauds as great successes. The 1920s, as Berk admits, saw not the triumph of the new competition, but the success of those companies who thumbed their noses at the FTC—until the Great Depression brought them to their knees.

Virginia Commonwealth University

MELVIN I. UROFSKY


This monumental history of the Federal Reserve (Fed) will stand for a long time as the definitive account. These two books that constitute volume 2 follow on in approach, style, and substance from volume 1, which appeared in 2003. Meltzer, one of the profession’s most distinguished economists, has been watching the Fed for a long time. He was a founder member of the Shadow Open Market Committee in the early 1970s, tracking and commenting on the policy and performance of the Fed. Even earlier, in the 1960s, he had been asked by a congressman to produce a study of the Fed’s operations. That latter was the real source of his interest in the Fed’s behaviour, and it helps explain his central interest, which is the making and implementation of monetary policy.

The approach is essentially to let the story unfold. He wishes to show how and why policy decisions were made and so relies heavily on the transcripts, or memoranda of
discussion, of the Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC), that he refers to as minutes. He also uses some related papers, memoirs, diaries, and interviews with leading participants. The first book covers the period 1951 to 1969 and the second 1970 to 1986. There is no reason for the division other than the physical necessity of avoiding a book with over 1,300 pages. All the references and the index are at the end of book 2. Each book comprises a few very long chapters covering chronological chunks of years.

Book 1 is made up of an introduction and three long chapters. The introduction reviews the main issues in monetary policy and theory in the period and gives a summary of the book’s main findings. That is followed by a highly detailed discussion of policy-making across the period: a new beginning in the 1950s; the early Keynesian era of 1961–5; and the first phase of the great inflation of the second half of the 1960s. Book 2 begins with a chapter on the international economy followed by four on controls; the monetary policy failure of the 1970s; the disinflation of 1979–82; and then restoring stability in 1983–6. There is a concluding chapter that draws out the main points of his story and also places them in the context of the changes in monetary theory that took place over his period. Meltzer also adds some thoughts on how policy-making could be improved, particularly through focusing on longer-term objectives and on expressing a clearer position on the Fed’s role of lender of last resort and on ending the too-big-to-fail policy.

Meltzer is highly critical of the Fed—not the officials for whose integrity he has the highest regard, but the institution. Firstly, his central criticism is that, notwithstanding the dual mandate, the Fed inclined much more heavily to a concern with unemployment than with price stability. Secondly, and also associated with its dual mandate, is a theme that runs through the entire history of the Fed: the failure to protect its independence. The changing meaning of independence is ever present. The Fed lost its independence after the calamity of the Great Depression, and then is said to have regained it in 1951, but Meltzer shows how the chairman, Martin, accepted a political constraint that meant helping to finance deficits. It certainly seemed to give in easily to political pressure in the 1960s, when under President Johnson the Fed readily financed the fiscal deficits and so paved the way for the ‘great inflation’ of the late 1960s and 1970s—much of which was transmitted around the world by the pegged-exchange-rate system. Independence was restored under Volcker at the end of the 1970s, and for a brief period was the strongest form of independence enjoyed by the Fed in its history. However, Meltzer acknowledges that behind the Fed’s failures there were also other guilty parties. The economic models and theories of the time contributed to the errors made. Principal among them were those that produced the view that money was irrelevant and could be dismissed. There were committee members who voiced reservations and even objections to many policy moves, and their reservations and objections are all recorded and reported, but they were seldom embraced.

The Fed was responsible for the regulation of the banks but there is little explicit treatment of that subject, or of some others for which the historian of business or institutions might be looking, topics such as how the Fed was financed and how effectively it used its funds (numbers employed, profitability, and so on). However, these omissions are explained by the author’s central concern with monetary policy. Although the history ends in 1986 there is an epilogue on the recent financial crisis. Extremely valuable though it is to have Meltzer’s views on the crisis, at first glance this looks slightly odd and potentially detached, although in fact Meltzer uses the episode to demonstrate how valid his criticisms are, particularly, how fragile the claims of independence turn out to be, showing how easily the Fed lost its much trumpeted independence in the crisis.

CASS Business School

FORREST CAPIE
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Economic History Review, 64, 1 (2011)
Questions about the future of the dollar as a world currency have been part of the international agenda periodically since the early 1960s when the Triffin paradox and Gaullist anti-Americanism first saw the light of day. The urgency of the question has of course varied as the world economy has become progressively more open and new players (for example, China, India, Russia) have joined the game. This collection of essays, coming on the heels of the global banking crisis, seems particularly well timed: many of the authors were putting the final touches to their efforts when the system went into ‘toxic shock’. The contributors are a group of economists, political scientists, international relations experts, and historians (Marcello de Cecco and Harold James).

The volume offers a variety of analyses ranging from the ‘sustainable’ camp to what is characterized as the ‘declinist’ view: those who see the dollar’s role under threat. Of course, within these broad categories there are nuances. For example, declinists differ about the circumstances in which the dollar’s demise may occur. It is interesting to note that the range of views seems to correlate roughly with the contributors’ academic discipline. Those who feel that the currency still has considerable mileage base their view on an essentially economistic market-driven model. Thus James (chapter 2) and Robert McKinnon (chapter 6) see advantages (transactional networks, externalities, depth of liquidity) to individuals and businesses considerably outweighing threats arising from political interests; for example, the vast overhang of dollar balances held by potential rivals such as China and Japan. This is not to imply that political factors are ignored; thus McKinnon points out that the protectionist lobby in the US is looking for major concessions from the Chinese and failing an ‘adequate’ response considerable disruption of trade might follow. This, while not fatal to the dollar’s position, would usher in a period of considerably greater volatility. Declinists on the other hand see the dollar’s role as deriving from state-driven, geopolitical forces. During the Cold War, for example, it was highly advantageous for the US and its allies (from the perspectives of security and political influence) to have the dollar as ‘top dog’. As security issues changed so the imperative to retain the dollar’s status also changed. Also some in the declinist camp argue that continued weakness of the dollar will induce diversification (by China, Japan, and others) to harder currencies and this will threaten the dollar’s position. However, there is a built-in disincentive here; the very size of the balances makes ‘diversification’ problematical. Selling the dollar lowers the value of remaining dollar assets so all but the first out would be hurt by a ‘rush for the exit’.

Underpinning much of the analysis of the declinist camp is the notion that global currencies are ultimately undermined when a credible rival comes into view. The rise and fall of sterling is an obvious example. In the 1970s, the yen and the Deutschmark were seen as potential rivals but were never seriously ‘positioned’ to replace the dollar as both the German and the Japanese authorities were reluctant to make the institutional changes (open, liquid, and deep capital markets), normally a feature of the key currency. Several authors in this volume consider the euro as a potential rival in the near future. There is a degree of scepticism about such a development however (see Cohen’s and Calleo’s contributions). Such scepticism is well placed and will have been further deepened given the Greek crisis besetting the euro in 2010. Indeed, the financial condition of the so-called PIIGS (Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain) makes discussion of the euro displacing the dollar singularly ill conceived.

In addition to the general analyses of the role of the dollar there are two pieces deserving particular comment. Chapter 5 provides a detailed, engrossing discussion by Herman Schwarz of the impact on the dollar of the US housing market and the role of the housing agencies Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. In the 1990s the latter created ever more liquid
instruments with enticing yields based on mortgage debt. This encouraged international investors to take on large dollar positions which contributed to the resurgence of the dollar in the 1990s and the early twenty-first century but ultimately led to huge losses and the subsequent global crisis. Chapter 6 by de Cecco offers a superb, exemplary discussion of the pre-1914 financial system and what lessons it still offers today. All told this collection offers a series of thoughtful analyses of the dollar’s sources of strength and weakness. The contributions are accessibly written and provide students across all disciplines with an excellent summary of the current state of the debate.

University of Liverpool

BERNARD FOLEY


Comparisons of the Roman Empire and the US have become ever more common over the last 20 years, since the collapse of the Soviet Union; as Smil notes, ‘the list of prominent US intellectuals who have not surfed this fashionable wave may be shorter than the list of those who have published such facile comparisons’ (p. x), and European writers and innumerable bloggers have followed in their wake. The analogy has been adopted to some extent by critics of US foreign policy, arguing that the Romans would have done a better job in Iraq or Afghanistan, but it is favoured above all by the supporters of American dominance, who draw on it either to encourage the US to be more assertive in using its power to spread peace and civilization, as the Romans allegedly did, or to identify threats to its continuing hegemony (hi-tech terrorists are the new barbarians, according to Robert Nye). Smil sets out to offer a correction to this misleading comparison, showing how modern commentators have been misled by the apparent sophistication of Roman civilization into believing that Roman and American societies have something in common.

His main tool for this purpose, having first dismissed Rome’s claims to greatness by pointing out its restricted area and population in comparison even to other preindustrial empires, is a restatement of the conventional ‘primitivist’ account of the ancient economy. He emphasizes its technological inferiority, its dependence on agriculture and non-mineral sources of energy, the low life expectancy and limited standard of living of its population, and so forth. On this account, the only point of resemblance between Rome and the US is the fact that the actual power and military capability of each society are revealed to be significantly inferior to their reputation. Smil’s account is largely one-sided, dealing with the arguments of historians who take a more optimistic view of ancient development largely by ignoring them and by constantly emphasizing the contrast with modernity; that does make sense, given his over-arching theme, but it does inevitably represent the classical past as primitive and non-modern rather than offering a more nuanced view of its level of development in comparison with other preindustrial societies. Nevertheless, in comparison to most synthetic accounts of the ancient world by non-specialists (recent work in the field of business studies on ‘ancient globalisation’, for example), Smil’s version is wide-ranging, up-to-date, and sophisticated, showing a lively awareness of current issues and drawing intelligently on the work of Walter Scheidel; he does misinterpret an article by this reviewer, but it is only a minor point.

However, informative and readable though it is, it is difficult to imagine that Smil’s critique of the ‘America as new Rome’ tradition will persuade anyone who was not already inclined to reject the analogy. This is above all because he does not adequately explore the real reasons why the comparison is so pervasive; instead of drawing on studies of the uses of exemplarity and historical analogy within modernity, he treats it simply as the result of a deficiency in historical knowledge. It seems unlikely that many journalists or commen-
tators will be impressed by what will appear as historical pedantry. Rome has been the archetypal empire, the inevitable point of comparison for every modern empire for centuries, because of the power of its image and the tradition of its reception; few of these writers have actually believed in the identity of ancient and modern, but they have found the idea of Rome ‘good to think with’, a mirror in which they can explore their own fears and ideals and consider their own society in the context of broader conceptions of historical development. The fact that the idea of Rome may be far removed from historical reality does not necessarily render it useless as a mirror.


Woods has ‘worked for many years on infant and child mortality and the problems surrounding their explanation’ (p. vii). However, in recent years it has become increasingly clear that foetal development has a considerable bearing not only on infant and child survival rates but also on adult health, and this forms the basis of the current volume. The result is an extremely rich and wide-ranging study of foetal health and mortality in many different parts of the world over more than 400 years. It combines a wealth of statistical information with copious extracts from contemporary accounts of midwifery and obstetric procedure.

The book is divided into eight substantial chapters. In chapter 1, Woods explains the significance of the topic and summarizes the existing literature. Although there is a vast literature on both infant and child mortality and maternal mortality, this is the first book-length study to consider foetal mortality in its own right. One of the main reasons for this neglect has been the difficulty of obtaining systematic and reliable evidence of foetal mortality rates in many parts of the world until well into the twentieth century, but Woods seeks to compensate for this by using present-day estimates of the relationship between different types of mortality to fill some of the historical gaps. This has enabled him to present new estimates of the extent of stillbirths in England from the 1580s onwards. He then goes on to examine the contemporary literature on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century midwifery and the debate over the causes of foetal mortality in the twentieth century. The two key figures in this debate were John William Ballantyne (1861–1923), who adopted a broadly ‘pathological’ approach to understanding stillbirths, and Dugald Baird (1899–1986), who emphasized the importance of social and epidemiological factors.

It is arguable that the most important single chapter in the volume is chapter 7, which summarizes Woods’ arguments about the extent and causes of the decline in stillbirths during the eighteenth century. In an article that first appeared in this journal in 1998, Tony Wrigley estimated that the stillbirth rate in England and Wales fell from 100–125 deaths per thousand births at the end of the seventeenth century to 40–50 deaths per thousand births in the mid-nineteenth century. However, Woods argues that the true rate of stillbirth mortality at the start of this period was much closer to 60 deaths per thousand births, or 70 at most (p. 211). He also takes issue with Wrigley’s efforts to link the decline in stillbirth mortality to improvements in maternal nutrition. He thinks that ‘the grounds for a positive interpretation’ of trends in the height and nutrition of young females ‘are not overwhelming’ (p. 212) and that the decline in the incidence of stillbirths was more likely to have been caused by a reduction in the incidence of infectious diseases in general, and smallpox infection in particular. However, he also concedes that ‘there is no concrete and unassailable proof that smallpox in pregnancy had a marked impact’ on either foetal or maternal mortality, and that the argument itself remains ‘hypothetical’ (p. 231).
In view of this, it may perhaps be worth revisiting the question of height and ‘nutrition’. Here there are several points that might be made, although there is only space for two. In the first place, although Woods might have made more reference to the work of Stephen Nicholas and Deborah Oxley, he is probably right to argue that there is very little direct evidence relating to the heights of adult females before the end of the eighteenth century, but there is a substantial body of evidence relating to male stature. Woods cites John Komlos’s argument that average male heights declined during the second half of the eighteenth century, but makes no reference to the original estimates that were published by Roderick Floud, Kenneth Wachter, and Annabel Gregory in *Height, health and history: nutritional status in the United Kingdom, 1750–1980* (1990), or to their refutation of Komlos’s reinterpretation of those estimates. Secondly, although this material did not appear before the publication of Woods’s volume, new evidence suggests that the amount of food available for human consumption in England and Wales did increase over the course of the eighteenth century (the evidence was published in an April 2010 NBER working paper). While this evidence does not necessarily substantiate the thesis that changes in diet caused either the reduction in stillbirth mortality or even the increase in average male stature, it does suggest that the answer to the questions raised by Woods remains open to debate.

*University of Southampton*  

BERNARD HARRIS


Commodities that circulated across the seas and oceans and were consumed by a wide variety of societies in the pre-colonial and colonial periods have attracted a good deal of scholarly attention, mainly from economic historians. Recently, efforts have been made to form collaborative groups of scholars with diverse research interests and orientations to investigate the social, economic, and cultural dimensions of commercial commodities. Quite a few such ventures have already come to fruition and the results are now available in the volumes that have been lately edited and published. *How India clothed the world* is an outcome of the initiatives of the Global Economic History Network (GEHN) to study the history of textile production and trade in the early modern period (a further GEHN volume, edited by Riello and Prasannan Parthasarathi, was published in 2009 as *The spinning world: a global history of cotton textiles, 1200–1850*). The book begins with an introduction in which the editors outline the historiographical context and the thematic structure of the book, and provide a brief overview of all 15 scholarly contributions. The book is divided into three parts, each of which contains five chapters clustered according to their respective themes and areas of focus.

Chapters in part I deal with the aspects of south Asian textile and cotton exports to non-western markets, especially to south–east Asia; east, east-central, and west Africa; and China. The authors here examine the intra-Asian and Afro-Asian textile trade from the perspectives of the role consumers played in determining the demand for cotton and textiles and the influence they exerted on producers and supplies with regard to quality, colour, and texture. In part II, the authors analyse the changing dynamics of the textile industry in south Asia in the early modern period. The narratives in this section are largely informed by the economic implications of south Asia’s colonial transition in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, especially the changes it introduced in the structure of textile manufacture and procurement in Bengal and south-eastern India. Chapters in part III explore the dimensions of Euro-Asian textile trade and question the conventional view that considers the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century a
purely European story. The authors here emphasize the role of Asian imports into Europe and the exchange of technical and technological knowledge between India and Europe in shaping the fashion and taste for cotton textiles in Europe and in determining the quality of product there. They attribute the global success of European textiles in the nineteenth century to these unique processes of interaction, adoption, and adaptation.

A dominant trend in the historiography of early modern south Asian textiles has been to examine the relative decline of the textiles industry in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In revisiting the world of south Asian textiles, the authors of this book have inevitably addressed the issues concerning the decline and the so-called ‘great divergence’, challenged some established interpretations, and suggested alternative explanations. In so doing, they have not only drawn upon the existing literature and offered correctives but have also culled a great deal of primary data from archival sources. Until recently, the production and exchange of textiles were understood as purely economic activities in which production technology, weavers, merchants, companies, and markets played a prominent role. This volume, instead, invokes consumer choice, fashion, gender, social hierarchy, aesthetics, and the dissemination of knowledge as playing important roles in determining the consumption and production of textiles in both Asia and Europe. It also seeks to globalize the perspective on the textile industry of south Asia and the revolution in European textile production in order to rescue the historiography from becoming region- or nation-centric. The book successfully meets the two objectives the editors set out in the introduction, namely, to provide ‘a comprehensive introduction to the key issues characterizing the story of cotton textiles in the Indian Ocean’ and to ‘revisit the Indian Ocean and Indian textiles in search of new meanings’ (pp. 26–7). The book touches upon a broad range of issues involved in understanding the history of textiles, offers fresh perspectives, and proposes new ways of looking at the early modern textile industry. Instead of just offering conclusive answers, the authors open up the discussion and call for further investigation of the historical trajectory of textile production and exchange. The book is provocative and will stimulate scholars and students alike to approach the history of south Asian textile production and trade from the new perspectives.

The book is nicely produced. It contains a number of coloured illustrations of textiles and their different stages of production, a fine glossary of non-English terms, and an exhaustive bibliography. It is a useful contribution to the literature on global textile production and trade.


This excellent volume is a significant addition to the growing number of multi-authored histories of globally traded commodities. Its central theme is the global diffusion of Indian cottons from c.1600 and the politico-economic reactions this provoked in the countries affected. Its contributors debate a number of sub-themes: whether cotton fabrics succeeded on grounds of cheapness or of aesthetic appeal; the impact of Indian cottons on indigenous textile industries and consumer cultures; the roles in cotton production of female labour and of merchant capital; and why Europe, not Asia, technologically revolutionized production.

The editors’ introduction draws some of these themes together, but the reader is left, on the whole, to synthesize the ensuing discussions. These begin with Parthasarathi’s review of India’s celebrated cotton industry: India’s advantages lay not in its cloth-making
technologies, which differed little from European ones, but in the skills of its weavers and dyers, whose richly finished products bedazzled consumers. The diffusion of Indian cottons in Asia, Africa, and Turkey occupies a number of studies. Dutch exports of Indian cottons to south-east Asia, Om Prakash argues, commanded the Indonesian market until the 1660s, proving better and cheaper than the domestic products they displaced. The trade faltered, as local producers imitated Indian fabrics, which themselves rose steeply in price, switching the focus of Dutch exports to Europe. William Clarence-Smith is adamant that Indian textile imports stimulated rather than retarded south-east Asian manufacturing techniques; these skills, reinforced by weaving technologies diffused by mobile Chinese artisans, provided the basis for the industry’s dynamic eighteenth-century expansion. Colleen Krieger argues that west African consumer preferences ensured that Indian cottons imported to the region in the slave trade were variants of domestically produced cloths. Indigenous producers adapted to this competition, even unravelling imported cottons to supply yarn for the production of luxury cloths. Indian textiles also flooded into east Africa, Pedro Machado shows, marketed mainly by mobile Gujarati, not European, merchants: material objects used to reinforce elite authority but which devastated indigenous textile production.

The impact of Indian textiles on China and Japan was more varied. For China, Harriet Zurndorfer and Bozhong Li emphasize domestic not Indian influences on cotton production, but agree on little else. For Zurndorfer, cotton was produced within a peasant handicraft rather than a putting-out system, in which abundant, cheap female labour discouraged technical innovation. Li stresses the rising productivity of cotton’s highly paid female labour force and the dynamic power of merchant capitalists. The two essays on Japan also provide contrasts. Masayuki Tanimoto argues that cotton production emerged in the seventeenth century as a substitute for Chinese imports and was based on female-dominated household production, thus reinforcing an embryonic peasant economy. Fujita Kayoko takes a different tack. Japan’s textile market was refreshed by Dutch imports of Indian textiles in the late seventeenth century, which had an indelible influence on Japanese manufacturing styles, due to the enduring attractiveness of Indian motifs to Japanese consumers.

The Ottoman cotton industry originated in the sixteenth century on a home-market basis; but the growing popularity of Indian textiles with well-off consumers induced imitative production, modestly successful, Suraiya Faroqhi argues, in supplying home and foreign markets. This promising development was frustrated by the same forces that restrained Ottoman industrial expansion as a whole: state economic policies that prioritized fiscalism and domestic consumption over exports. Maureen Mazzaoui reviews the European cotton industry’s early history, tracing its path from its thirteenth-century north Italian origins to southern Germany and north-west Europe, emphasizing the intra- and inter-regional competition between urban and rural producers.

The success of cottons in Atlantic markets after 1600, Riello contends, reflected not low prices but their visual allure, and European industry’s capacity to naturalize the exotic in imitations of Indian textiles. Beverly Lemire shows that this rage for Indian fabrics had long antecedents in the spread of Indian products from the 1550s, first as furnishings and then as garments. John Styles is less exuberant. Cottons only displaced linens in Britain from the 1770s in outer garments, on grounds of appearance rather than price and did not supersede linens in undergarments until the 1820s: the notion that cheap cotton underwear lowered industrial revolution mortality is mythical. Pat Hudson shows that woollens were not cottons’ poor relations during British industrialization. She demolished the notion that woollen production was constrained by deficient wool supplies, showing, as does Styles, that woollens were competitive with cottons where their markets overlapped. Cotton’s advantage was that the British state protected it in the domestic market and promoted it in the foreign. Patrick O’Brien extends the view that Britain’s technological lead in cottons
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was rooted in mercantilist policies, which secured raw cotton supplies and pushed sales of cottons in colonial markets. Robert Du Plessis shows cottons (and linens) edging woollens out of British and French colonial markets; cottons were more expensive than competing fabrics, but increasingly popular with female consumers, black and white. This stress on the importance for cottons of mechanization of protected British-colonial markets evokes some scepticism: it lacks a statistical demonstration; and overlooks Ralph Davis’s argument that domestic demand was sufficient to generate an optimum factory technology, the fact that Britain subsidized linen not cotton exports, and the huge surge in woollen exports to British America in the period 1750–75. Finally, Olivier Raveux examines the origins of French ‘indiennes’ in seventeenth-century Marseilles; Marta Vicente reviews cotton’s role in the racial politics of eighteenth-century Spanish America; and the volume ends appropriately with Parthasarathi and Ian Wendt’s review of the collapse of India’s cotton industry under western competition. This well-edited collection is also beautifully illustrated and designed, as befits its rich and fascinating content.

University of Manchester


Medical historians have traditionally focused on what happened inside institutions and they have privileged the medical professional’s side of doctor-patient relationships. Only with pioneering work such as Peter Bartlett and David Wright, eds., Outside the walls of the asylum: the history of care in the community, 1750–2000 (1999) did the multiple loci of care and the inherently porous nature of institutions become apparent. Patients entered, left, and sometimes re-entered institutions as organizational and public policy or their own state of mind or body, entitlements, and familial circumstances shifted. Medical and ancillary staff too brought their own interpretations of the outside world into their workplace and took out consciously or unintentionally edited versions of what went on inside. Asylums and hospitals ‘leaked’ in other ways and visitors have always been an important, if under-studied, constituency in medical history. Like historic prisons and some modern hospitals, patient visitors were essential not only to maintain the morale of inmates, offering emotional support and a bridge to a ‘normal’, healthy world, but also sometimes to see to daily needs of feeding and cleaning. Historically, families and local government authorities were much more intimately involved in deciding whether to institutionalize and might even determine the day-to-day nature of an in-patient’s care regime. Those other than workers and patients trickled in and out: not just relatives and friends, but also individual or collective philanthropists driven by religious or secular interests in the house, official inspectors, and entertainers, who were especially important to long-term patients and to children, the latter the focus of four of the 13 chapters in this edited collection. Public visitors even included day-trippers or tourists, notoriously in the case of the early modern London Bedlam, but also in nineteenth-century America. As much as the nature of their patients, different religious ideals, approaches to benevolence, kinship structures, ideas of public and private spheres, funding needs, and political policies determined institutional approaches, ranging from more-or-less open acceptance of visiting to outright refusal. This path-breaking volume offers a geographically wide-ranging exploration of the social, cultural, and political dimensions of visiting over the last two-and-a-half centuries. However intermittent and occasional visiting might be, it contributed much more to routine public understandings of asylums and hospitals than did experience of being a patient or a doctor.

The first two substantive chapters cover visiting of general hospitals. Reinarz shows how admission in Victorian and Edwardian Birmingham was shaped not only by medical ideas,
but also by those of sex and social class, for not all potential callers were deemed morally suitable visitors. Michelle Renshaw discusses the role of families as food providers in Chinese missionary hospitals, which necessarily adopted a policy of near-open access that contrasted sharply with exclusion from British isolation hospitals during the Victorian era (Mooney). Institutionalizing the mad is often assumed to be a way of depriving them of ‘civil rights’, but in isolation hospitals too there was a tension between individual liberty and ideas of governance and the public good. Medical tourism (in the historic sense) declined over time and other types of visiting have also tended to contract, a process that began in the nineteenth century and accelerated after the introduction of the welfare state in Britain. The effect of the professionalization of nursing in diminishing maternal visiting is demonstrated by Andrea Tanner in the Victorian London Children’s Hospital, a development that bears comparison with the contemporary feminization of British school-teaching. There was more continuity in expert visiting, like Edward Mapother in India and Ceylon in the early twentieth century (James Mills and Sanjeev Jain). Official visiting could be problematic for institutions with something to hide (Leonard Smith), but most welcomed the opportunity to show off their achievements, to gain kudos from association with influential and experienced officials and clinicians, and to learn from their observations.

Visiting by those not immediately concerned with individual sufferers can result in patients as a group becoming a spectacle (a consumer commodity) but it also opened up the institution to scrutiny, especially important for lunatic asylums, which are covered in the final five chapters. Asylum ‘tourism’ allows the historian to analyse everyday attitudes towards the mentally ill, revealing important ways in which societal understandings of insanity were created (Janet Miron). For comparison it might be worthwhile exploring how asylums were made to look in regional and national newspapers or periodicals, or in films and novels. Early hospitals and asylums managed their public images carefully, for without donations they could not have continued, and Kevin Siena reveals how the London Lock Hospital tried to put a positive spin on the least morally appealing of patients, the syphilitic. Readers of this journal might be curious about the monetary or other costs and benefits of having permeable walls, but a pioneering work like this should stimulate such comments and there is more than enough to interest a wide range of readers. Apparently periodic and momentary interactions resulting from visits mediated and manifested issues as diverse as civic governance, philanthropy, public opinion, civil society, and citizenship. Tied together by a helpful introduction that classifies types of visitor, the chapters reveal much about countries and time periods that are utterly different in wealth, ethnic composition, occupational make-up, religious affiliations, and history and healthcare institutions; the sheer diversity of experience brings out the ubiquity and importance of visiting as a phenomenon. It is a thoroughly worthwhile collection, wide-ranging, well-written, and fascinating, not to mention especially timely when hospitals have again become, as they could be in the days before antibiotics, potentially places of danger as much as succour.

University of St Andrews

R. A. HOUSTON


This book was initially intended as a collection of papers presented at a conference in Rochester that had the objective of honouring Stanley Engerman. However, the premature death of one of the organizers of that conference and co-author of one of the papers, Sokoloff, converted the edited book into an homage to these two influential and innovative economic US historians. The conference and book are devoted to reporting a variety of
studies in the topics that Engerman explored during his academic career. The essays number 12 in total, and are preceded by a brief introduction by the editors.

Part I is devoted to essays focused on health and living standards. Robert Fogel leads off the first section with a piece on the relation between biotechnology and life expectancy. He provides a trenchant account of the contribution of technological innovation to human health. Up to the Second World War, improved food access and sanitation measures accounted for much of the life expectancy gains which were translated rapidly into GDP advances. Since then, however, the improvements in medical care, accompanied by an increase in health expenditures, have raised the age of death but at considerable cost and with little effect on output. In the next chapter, Richard H. Steckel concludes that the transition from hunter-gatherers to settled agriculture damaged human health. He supports this strong argument with the sparse skeletal evidence already available. In the last chapter of this part, George Boyer explores how Britain created public and private institutions in response to workers’ insecurity of income. He concludes that these institutions had a beneficial impact over overall productivity and workers’ welfare.

The second part is devoted to essays on the relation between institutions and schooling. Engerman, Elisa Mariscal, and Sokoloff deal with the important question of why citizens of countries in South and Central America were less educated than citizens of the US and Canada. After considering an exhaustive list of possible causes, they conclude that it was the extreme inequalities, both economic and political, that led to low investment in education. In a complementary chapter, Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz examine why investment in education was comparatively so high in the US. They conclude that the particular nature of educational finance in the US, decentralized and based on local taxes, resulted in schools that were better connected with the necessities and requirements of the local population. In the last chapter of this part, Michael Edelstein explores graduation rates from engineering school in New York State over a period of 150 years.

The last two parts of the book contain a miscellany of chapters. In an innovative contribution, David Galenson and Robert Jensen analyse the life-cycle value of artwork. From their study of auction prices for paintings, they conclude that two types of artists existed: conceptual artists who create their important paintings at early stages of their careers and experimental artists who produce paintings of increasing importance and financial value throughout their lifetime. This evidence imposes serious doubt upon the standard interpretation of human capital depreciation. In the next paper, Peter Temin shows that Jews have been over-represented among the richest 400 Americans and relates this phenomenon to their network relations. Note that these results contradict others’ recent interpretations that relates Jewish success to human capital accumulation. Robert Steinfeld studies the harsh labour regulations allowing violence by bosses upon workers that were in force in England up to 1875. He argues that these laws protected employers from workers’ opportunism, particularly when workers were educated in their workplace. Finally, Hugh Rockoff discusses the importance and relevance of usury laws in comparative perspective. Not surprisingly, he concludes that these laws could affect investment negatively.

As is common among volumes derived from a conference, the virtues of the genre are its vices. Together, the essays of this book produce a mosaic picture of many of the preoccupations of the US cliometricians: institutions, human capital, health, anthropometrics, comparative history, labour conditions, and so on. With perhaps a couple of exceptions, I found the essays informative, well crafted, and interesting. Several could also be used in the readings lists for intermediate and advanced courses in economic history. However, the organizers have not crafted a powerful and comprehensive volume to match the title of the book. In the end, this is an odd combination of papers on human capital and a collection of other papers that almost seem to have walked in from a different conference.

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

JOAN R. ROSES
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This collection of eight conference papers offers a survey of how social scientists in a range of disciplines have come to apply the concept of path dependence to explain processes of change. Political scientists, sociologists, geographers, organizational scholars, and others have built upon the ideas of such economists and economic historians as Paul David, W. Brian Arthur, and Douglass North. As this volume shows, they have developed some useful insights, particularly on institutional change, but the conceptual confusion over path dependence that began in economics has carried over into other disciplines as well.

This confusion is evident in the ways that several of the contributions here wrestle with the definition of path dependence. The editors introduce the book with an essay that surveys the contributions of David, Arthur, North, the critics Stan Liebowitz and Stephen Margolis, and others without doing much either to synthesize their views or to illuminate the reasons for their differing perspectives. The editors also note some of the differences in perspective among contributors to this volume, but they do not take the opportunity to clarify the roots of these differences or to sort out which definitions are useful.

The first contributor, an historian (Bo Stråth), associates path dependence with structural, teleological views of history that explain paths of outcomes as the deterministic result of socioeconomic factors. He argues against this by pointing to different ways that Sweden and Germany responded to the crisis of the 1930s. Stråth’s historical account is interesting, but his conception of path dependence is nearly the opposite of what the theorists of path dependence proposed: that paths of outcomes depend on non-systematic events in the past.

Gary Libecap, an economic historian, discusses small-farm settlement in the dryer regions of the North American Great Plains as the inappropriate, path-dependent result of mistaken expectations about rainfall together with the legacy of land-grant laws that were more appropriate for wetter regions settled earlier. Small farms soon failed and holdings were consolidated into viable farm sizes. There were no substantial forces operating to maintain early choices and patterns of outcomes, so Libecap’s invocation of path dependence appears dubious.

Much more interesting is the account by another economic historian, Lena Andersson-Skog, of path dependence in the evolution of institutions related to railways. She sensibly defines path dependence as ‘that early developments have profound and disproportionate effects on later developments’ (p. 70) and she shows how the work of numerous scholars on numerous aspects of railways is usefully interpreted in terms of path dependence. In the process she draws together the literatures on large technical systems, institutional change generally, several aspects of railway policy, and standardization of track gauge. Her synthesis is one that was waiting to be done, and she has done it well.

Magnus Lagerholm and Anders Malmberg offer a survey of how path dependence has become a major interpretive theme in economic geography, including in the analysis of spatial clustering of economic activity. PerOla Öberg and Kajsa Hallberg Adu present a valuable discussion of the strong recent influence of path-dependence analysis in political science. They caution that the role of individual political actors must not be neglected.

Rogers Hollingsworth considers how path dependence in research institutions and organizational structures has affected the pace of scientific discoveries.

Stephen Margolis, an economist, contributes a paper reprising his critique of the theory of path dependence. In his view, opportunities for profit in ‘private actions’ override path dependence wherever it might matter for outcomes, but he finds substantial opportunity for path dependence and inefficiency in ‘public sector actions’ (pp. 181–3). In my view, Margolis errs in thinking that path dependence matters only when it leads to a readily correctible but somehow uncorrected inefficiency. More important is simply the way that
past actions constrain later incentives and choices. Margolis suggests, for example, that my own research on railway track gauge allows for the interpretation that selected standard gauges have reflected systematic tests of which gauge was most suitable (p. 188). In fact, my most recent work (*Tracks across continents, paths through history*, 2009) shows that railway officials in both Britain and North America standardized gauges by choosing the gauge with the most extensive historical legacy, despite a strong consensus in each case favouring a broader gauge as superior. I must note, however, that Margolis and his colleague Stan Liebowitz made an important contribution by showing that private, profit-seeking actions do at times override path dependence.

In the final contribution, Bernard Ebbinghaus, a sociologist, uses the example of welfare reform to discuss two metaphors that describe path dependence: the unplanned ‘trodden trail’, where increasing returns lead later actors to repeat the choices of earlier ones, and the ‘road juncture’, a branching point for alternative pathways. Like several other contributors, he demonstrates the fruitfulness of the concept of path dependence.

King’s College, New York

Douglas J. Puffert


The issues Folbre addresses in this book are as old as sexual reproduction, and as new as *Time* magazine’s recent cover story, ‘The new Sheriffs of Wall Street: the women charged with cleaning up the mess’ (24 May 2010). Self-interest and the pursuit of wealth have long been celebrated as the drivers of capitalist development. The role of ethical boundaries receives less discussion, and the gendered nature of attributions of self-interest and virtue are mentioned more rarely still. Folbre’s work rectifies this lacuna.

Greed and lust, Folbre writes, reflect a desire for wealth or sex that, while healthy at some level, are taken to unvirtuous extremes or cause harm to others. Folbre reviews economic thought on these topics from Britain, France, and the US, and from feudalism to contemporary times. This is not, however, a work on the history of economic thought *per se*: Readers looking for an in-depth discussion of their favourite historical figure will be disappointed. Rather, Folbre states, ‘I write with a “presentist” orientation, more interested in the retrospective significance of historical debates than their meaning for those who participated at the time’ (p. xxv). Her central concern, from this ‘presentist’ viewpoint, is about how a currently disproportionate emphasis on the pursuit of self-interest might be balanced with a necessary and appropriate reclamation of moral limitations.

The history of greed is perhaps the more familiar and simpler case. Medieval and earlier religious condemnations of greed (manifested, for example, in prohibitions on interest-taking) generally gave way over time to praise for the virtuous outcomes of economic self-interest, practiced in markets. Folbre goes into detail on these points, highlighting subtle differences between, for example, the French Enlightenment thinking of Voltaire, Diderot, and others, and the British versions by Mandeville, Adam Smith, and so on, and the writings of the founders of the US. The gender sub-text of these writings has been less systematically explored, however, until this book. While self-interest and individual liberty were prescribed for men, dedication to family and submission to husbands were more often prescribed for women. It can be jarring to hear this expressed by supposed champions of freedom. Folbre quotes, for example, a letter from American founding father John Adams to his son: ‘There can never be any regular government of a nation without a marked subordination of mother and children to the father’ (p. 67). Early feminist thinkers, such as Harriet Taylor and Harriet Martineau, protested against such views.

Lust seems to have a more complex history than greed. While economic self-interest seems to have been consistently attributed to males (and denied to women) throughout the span of
time discussed, attributions of lust underwent a change. In earlier periods, women were generally seen (for example, by David Hume) as the sex more prone to sensual temptations; in the latter periods, men were generally considered more lustful. The imposition of a double standard, however, seems to be a fairly consistent theme: women’s sexuality was to be held down and controlled, while men’s was to be indulged, at least within limits. Mandeville, for example, in an interesting contribution to urban economics, proposed a system of municipal brothels ‘in which Women are hired as publickly as Horses at a Livery Stable’ (p. 53). Malthus, of course, is the most well-known economic thinker to whom sex and reproduction were of major concern, but Folbre also explores less well-known writings on sexuality by Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Charles Fourier, and many others.

By the Victorian era, dominant beliefs about greed and lust had gelled around the image of self-interested men participating in economic life, while virtuous, self-sacrificing (white, middle-class) women were the ‘angels’ of the home. Folbre explores complex commentaries about sexuality, commerce, and home production in this era from myriad feminist and socialist perspectives, as well as perspectives from within the mainstream of economics. Reviews of models of family behaviour, changing gender roles, and new research into the economics of care from the last few decades bring the book to its close.

Why is this history important? ‘It seems easier’, Folbre concludes, ‘to make women more self-interested than to make men more altruistic’ (p. 314). Yet, she argues, a better approach to moral obligations is needed if contemporary society is to be sustainably reproduced. Perhaps the task of ‘cleaning up the mess’ would be less necessary, or assigned with greater gender neutrality, if we were to take some lessons from the history that Folbre recounts.

This book provides a much-needed counterweight to those writings in the history of economic thought that overlook the role of gender, ignore reproductive work, and/or downplay the role of moral obligation in regulating economic functioning. If I have one criticism of the book, it is that it perhaps should have been two or three books, or more. Ideas are sometimes set out in an abrupt, telegraphic fashion, with less analysis than might have been optimal. That the index contains, by my count, 257 proper names, and the bibliography runs to 42 pages, gives an idea of the attempted breadth of this work. Greater depth is, perhaps, a project for future research.


In the late 1980s and early 1990s European economists, the British included, indulged in one of those periodic bouts of disciplinary introspection. There were many reasons for this, but undoubtedly part of the explanation lies in the struggle between liberal (in the European sense) and neo-liberal (in the American sense) conceptions of the appropriate roles of government and market. Two Swiss economists, Bruno Frey and Reiner Eichenberger, in the Journal of Economic Perspectives (1993) concluded that ‘America and Europe differ with regard to what economics is understood to be, how it is practised, and how professional academic economists behave’. Not all accepted this judgement and the assumption of the homogeneity of ‘European’ economists in particular was acknowledged by them as questionable; moreover, they were at pains to make clear that one consequence of the different market conditions facing European as against American economists was that in the former ‘economic knowledge is transformed more effectively into policy because the European professors . . . are more engaged in the study of local institutions and often pursue a political career’ (pp. 185, 192).
Fourcade’s study is not directly motivated by that debate, though elsewhere she has provided (with Sarah Babb) a comparative analysis of the renaissance of neo-liberalism, with Britain and France included, though not the US (American Journal of Sociology, 2002). However, what she does do in this compelling and deeply researched study is explore the processes whereby national institutional dynamics structure academic disciplines, namely, how political and economic forces shape professional identities, practical activities, and disciplinary projects. ‘One of the most important aims of this book is to specify how not just the institutional but also the intellectual framework of economics varies across nations’ (p. 153). To do so, Fourcade structures this study on the basis of an initial and substantial theoretical section followed by her three country case studies, these organized both chronologically and thematically. There is then a long concluding chapter which is much more than just a summary.

The three countries’ academic disciplines are characterized as having been shaped principally by market institutions (US), public-minded elites (UK), and statism (France). Throughout, Fourcade is thoroughly aware of the methodological difficulties of comparative intellectual and institutional history, exemplified by the very different meanings in political culture of the ‘state’ as between the three countries. What results is a methodological eclecticism on her part and very deep reading of the three national literatures on disciplinary advance. This equips her to be much more attentive than is normally the case with comparative analyses to what is genuinely different at a national level. Most promisingly, she eschews descriptive variables for a focus upon processes and mechanisms so that one can ask, and answer more satisfactorily, ‘Under which intellectual and institutional conditions did economic knowledge establish its place in the realm of higher learning?’ (p. 13). This, in turn, then leads to how effectively each countries’ economists deployed that knowledge to their and, hopefully, society’s benefit.

The distribution of power and authority is identified as a central factor in the three countries’ production and organization of economic knowledge: hence US economists, in her terminology, as ‘merchant professionals’; the British, at least for the first half-century or so of professionalizing economics, as public-minded elites; and the French as the product of statism. Whilst convergence forces (Americanization/internationalization) can easily be accommodated within this structure, it is the durability—path-dependency even—of national disciplines in the face of the common challenges that is of primary interest for Fourcade. It is impossible here even to summarize the three national stories, but in recommending this book highly I hope that readers will not skip the theoretical section nor limit their reading to the chapter on the country of their principal research interest. In particular, and as something of an antidote to the normal Anglo-American comparisons, the chapter on France repays a close reading. French economics is currently experiencing a major identity crisis, including an eruption of discontent amongst students about the hegemony of formalism and neo-classical theory, characterized by them as autisme-économie and with the ambition for a post-autistic economics to address real world problems. Fourcade’s book was completed some time before the Great Moderation gave way to the Great Recession. Thus, beyond its purview lies the issue of the culpability of the mainstream economics profession put so boldly by Paul Krugman (‘How did economists get it so wrong?’, New York Times, 2 September 2009). A reading of Fourcade on how we got to where we are now would undoubtedly have helped Krugman as indeed all of us. Finally, and before you ask, no there is no mention of economic history in this book. This is disappointing for many reasons, not least that it represents a missed opportunity to use our field as a case study to illuminate further the different national trajectories. However, this is but a minor blemish on what is otherwise a splendid volume which breaks new ground methodologically and is a major contribution to the history and sociology of western economics.

University of Bristol

ROGER MIDDLETON
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Alternative Titles: Britain, Great Britain, U.K., United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. United Kingdom, island country located off the northwestern coast of mainland Europe. The United Kingdom comprises the whole of the island of Great Britain—which contains England, Wales, and Scotland—as well as the northern portion of the island of Ireland. The name Britain is sometimes used to refer to the United Kingdom as a whole. The origins of the United Kingdom can be traced to the time of the Anglo-Saxon king Athelstan, who in the early 10th century secured the allegiance of neighbouring Celtic kingdoms and became the first to rule what previously many kings shared between them, in the words of a contemporary chronicle.