

Capitalism and the Historians Revisited

August 2016

Tyler Beck Goodspeed*

Abstract

Please do not cite.

This paper offers a broad survey of the teaching of history, at the graduate and undergraduate levels, at a sample of European, North American, South American, Asian, and Oceanic universities. In order to speak most directly to the commitment of the Mont Pelerin Society to liberty and free market principles, the survey focuses primarily on the teaching of economic history, the history of economic thought, as well as the history of capitalism. I find that instruction in economic history is generally favorable to the historical role of markets in economic development, though there are non-trivial differences between history as taught in economics departments versus history departments, as well as regional variation in methodology and content.

Keywords: economic history, history of economic thought, capitalism

* University of Oxford (tyler.goodspeed@economics.ox.ac.uk). I would like to thank Alex Chaufen, Alan Kors, and Eamonn Butler for helpful input to this preliminary draft.

1 Introduction

In 1954, in a departure from the Mont Pelerin Society's standard practice of non-publication, Friedrich Hayek published a concise, edited volume of collected essays by MPS members, under the title *Capitalism and the Historians*. The book's publication was motivated by a concern that many historians, still adhering to the intellectual legacy of Marxist interpretations of economic history generally and the industrial revolution particularly, were inaccurately characterizing the welfare effects of industrialization, to the considerable discredit of capitalism. The collected essays thus constituted an attempt not only to catalog that purported bias and to situate it within its broader intellectual history, but also to provide compelling historical evidence in support of the authors' contention that, contrary to the consensus view, the Industrial Revolution had not, in fact, had a deleterious effect on the welfare of the "laboring" or "working classes," but rather along many axes the opposite. The aim of this essay, similarly, is to provide a broad, preliminary overview of how history is taught around the world, focusing, as in *Capitalism and the Historians*, on the history of capitalism. My sample of undergraduate and graduate course syllabi is unavoidably limited and not entirely random, and thus must be treated as provisional. Nonetheless, several observations and patterns are worth noting.

I find that, in contrast to when *Capitalism and the Historians* was published, the teaching of economic history today is on the whole more favorable to the historical role of relatively free markets in generating the conditions for long-run economic development and rising living standards. I attribute this in part to the renewed research interest in economic history that has resulted from the explosion in historical data now available to historians and economists thanks to digitization. Not only, I suggest, has this allowed for more thorough empirical investigations of historical economic changes, it has also

attenuated the scope for theory or ideology to sustain tenuous historical hypotheses. I further find that, regardless of the merits or flaws of the work of Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson, their prodigious research agenda has, following the seminal work of Douglas North, redirected attention among historians and economists alike to the importance of “inclusive” economic and political institutions, and the pernicious and persistent effects of rent-seeking and “extractive” institutions. This reorientation in the focus of economic history research has encouraged, particularly through the exploitation of natural experiments in history, the identification of inferior economic outcomes as consequences in the first instance of inferior institutions, rather than of “capitalism.” Course syllabi reveal that in many regions and at many institutions, this shift in the research agenda of the field is rapidly being incorporated into historical instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

However, I also find that there are non-trivial departmental and regional variations in the substance of instruction in economic history and the history of economic thought. Economic history as taught in economics departments or in explicitly interdisciplinary programs, particularly in North America and Europe, are generally more likely to focus on quantitative empirical evidence, and thus seem to be relatively less dictated by pre-conceived theoretical or ideological suppositions. Second, whereas syllabi for courses in economic history in the United States, United Kingdom, and Germany typically include a significant number of articles from top general interest economics journals, as well as top field journals in economic history and development economics, that generally cast markets and “inclusive” economic and political institutions in a positive light, course syllabi in the rest of continental Europe and South America are more heavily weighted toward regional historical literatures which are less likely to be found in top-tier general interest or field journals, and are often less favorable to markets.

The remainder of this essay is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a brief background to *Capitalism and the Historians*, its motivation and content. Section 3 delineates the scope of the present survey. Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 discuss the teaching of economic history in North America, South America, Europe, and Asia, Africa, and Oceania, respectively. Section 8 offers summary concluding remarks and suggestions for further research.

2 Background

The primary motivation for the publication of *Capitalism and the Historians* was the authors' contention that, as Hayek put it, "The legend of the deterioration of the position of the working classes in consequence of the rise of 'capitalism' (or of the 'manufacturing' or the 'industrial system')" constituted a "supreme myth which more than any other has served to discredit the economic system to which we owe our present-day civilization." The socialist interpretation of economic history, Hayek continued, "Which has governed political thinking for the past two or three generations" and "remains almost universally accepted outside the circle of professional economic historians," had afforded many of its assertions "the status of 'facts which everyone knows,'" though in reality these assertions "have long been proved not to have been facts at all."

The essays comprising the collected volume, authored by T.S. Ashton, L.M. Hacker, B. de Jouvenal, and W.H. Hutt, therefore offered both an account of the origins of the purported anti-capitalist bias among then-contemporary historians, as well as an empirical counterargument to the standard narrative of the Industrial Revolution as resulting in the immiseration of the working classes. Ashton's two essays, in particular, both highlighted the difficulty in precisely identifying the causes of early-nineteenth century social conditions, given that those outcomes were hopelessly historically

overdetermined, and also emphasized the challenge in making any generalizations about changes in living standards among factory workers during the Industrial Revolution. All five essays, however, focused primarily on the views and writings of professional historians and economic historians themselves, and though the translation of historical myths within the academy into the content of instruction is implicit in the book's premise, this channel was never explicitly analyzed.

3 Scope

Given the breadth of the historical discipline, some limits have had to be imposed on the scale and coverage of this survey. First, while a comprehensive survey would include cultural history, social history, intellectual history, environmental history, political history, military history, and countless other historical subfields, I have chosen to focus more narrowly on economic history in order to speak most directly to the commitment of the Mont Pelerin Society to free market principles, as well as to provide a contemporary analog to the original motivation behind *Capitalism and the Historians*, which was to address the purported anti-capitalist bias within the historical profession. I broaden the analysis, however, to examine not only historical teaching of nineteenth-century industrialization, but also other salient topics in economic history, including the Great Depression of the twentieth century.

Second, documenting every economic history syllabus from every economics and history department at every university in every country would be a colossal undertaking, and far exceeds the limited resources available. Moreover, many institutions restrict access to course materials solely to university members, which limits available syllabi to courses at institutions with open access or MPS members, or else to courses for which instructors have posted syllabi to the websites of the Economic History Association,

Economic History Society, International Economic History Association, Cliometric Society, or European Historical Economics Society. Unfortunately, the result is that the sample is heavily weighted toward North America, and the United States in particular, with coverage of Africa, Asia, and Oceania at the present stage quite light. A complete list of all seventy five sampled universities is provided in Appendix A.

4 North America

In the United States and Canada, instruction in economic history has been profoundly affected in recent decades by the dramatic resurgence of interest in the field by the economics profession, particularly since the early 2000s. Whereas history departments at top-tier U.S. universities often retain a formally Marxist, or informally exploitationist approach to topics in economic history, with readings frequently including the likes of Thompson, Mintz, Wallerstein, Hobsbawm, and Polanyi, economics department offerings will generally include readings of North, Weingast, Acemoglu, Engerman, Sokoloff, Mokyr, and Nunn, and will focus on the latest econometric research.

To take a prominent and standard-setting example, with the retirement of Jeffrey Williamson in 2007, the Department of Economics at Harvard University, which had previously been the home of David Landes, Alexander Gerschenkron, and Joseph Schumpeter, was left with just one economic historian, in the person of Claudia Goldin. Though the department invited the eminent scholar Stanley Engerman to a temporary visiting position following Williamson's retirement, his teaching interests were by then primarily focused on the economics of sports and entertainment, suggesting that the department had lost interest in economic history as a worthwhile field for economic study. In the years since, however, the department has tenured Nathan Nunn, and at the junior level hired Richard Hornbeck, Eric Chaney, and Melissa Dell. All four are well trained in

econometrics, and their research is rooted in the use of natural experiments and differences-in-differences, exploiting temporal and geographic boundaries to test the effects, and persistence of effects, of exogenous events.

Nunn's research has focused on the role of cultural values, particularly trust and views on women, in long-run economic growth. Chaney's work is concentrated in the divergence of western Europe and the Muslim world after the Middle Ages, and the role of the emergence of the separation of powers and executive constraint in that divergence, while Dell's research has similarly demonstrated the persistent effects of extractive economic institutions. Hornbeck, analyzing the history of the development of the American economy, highlights the importance of capital and labor mobility in facilitating adjustment to adverse shocks, as well as the role of effective enforcement of private property rights. Their research interests are reflected in the considerable expansion of course offerings, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, in economic history, emphasizing the themes of their work.

In contrast, aside from economic and financial history courses taught by Niall Ferguson, who has now departed for a full-time senior research fellowship at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, and history of economic thought courses taught by Emma Rothschild, economic history courses offered by the Department of History at Harvard generally focus more on the history of capitalism, and tend to emphasize theoretical links between capitalism, imperialism, and slavery. Commodity history—particularly of sugar, cotton, and oil—and labor history feature prominently, and are often taught within a Marxist framework, with courses offered by Sven Beckert and Walter Johnson constituting the most prominent examples. At the graduate level, the department's signature course in the field, offered jointly with Harvard Law School, is titled "Political Economy of Modern Capitalism," and relies heavily on readings of Marxist economic historians.

A similar pattern is observed at other top tier U.S. universities. The Yale University economics department offers several regional courses in economic history, covering not only western Europe and the U.S., but also China, India, and Africa, approaching the subject from a development perspective, taught by Timothy Guinnane, Naomi Lamoreaux, and Jose-Antonio Espin-Sanchez, who studied under Joel Mokyr at Northwestern. Readings are heavily weighted toward recent empirical research in top-tier economics general interest or field journals. While the history department similarly offers largely ideologically agnostic courses on the economic history of China, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe, as well as the recent history of development, others focus more on the history of capitalism, and emphasize theoretical links between capitalism, imperialism, and slavery. As at Harvard, commodity and labor history feature prominently, and are often taught within a Marxist framework.

The history departments at Cornell, Columbia, Princeton, and Dartmouth likewise offer courses on the history of capitalism, with Mintz, Wallerstein, and Pomeranz typically appearing on course syllabi. At Dartmouth, a history department course on “the intellectual history of capitalism” includes unbalanced readings of Marx, Mill, Veblen, Keynes, Hayek, Polanyi, Friedman, Foucault, and Piketty. In contrast, a course on the history of economic thought offered by Douglas Irwin in Dartmouth’s Department of Economics focuses especially on the works of Adam Smith, Karl Marx, John Maynard Keynes, Friedrich Hayek, and Milton Friedman, and uses Lawrence White’s *The Clash of Economic Ideas* as a text. The most prominent exception to this pattern is perhaps the University of California-Berkeley, where, at least until the recent retirement of Jan de Vries, both the economics and history faculties boasted very strong economic history contingents, with de Vries in history and Eichengreen, Romer, Olney, and DeLong in economics. Moreover, while de Vries was a strong proponent of a supply-side view the

pre-Industrial Revolution “industrious revolution,” Romer, Olney, and DeLong generally adhere more to demand-side views of economic change.

At Stanford, meanwhile, Avner Greif and Ran Abramitzky, both trained by Joel Mokyr at Northwestern, offer courses in European economic history and institutional economics from a historical perspective. Abramitzky’s work focuses on the operation of market incentives and monitoring mechanisms in communal economy settings, looking particularly at the Israeli kibbutzim, while Greif’s research and teaching interests emphasize the role of private institutions in the effective enforcement of contracts and property rights prior to the rise of the fiscal and legal apparatus of the modern nation-state.

More generally, a common theme emerging in the instruction of economic history within U.S. economics departments is an emphasis on quantitative and empirical methods in economic history. Thus, readings on institutions in economic history will typically include not only Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson, and North, but also Banerjee, Iyer, Nunn, Hornbeck, Fenske, and Moser; readings on finance will include Calomiris, Neal, and Voth; readings on health will include Almond, Bleakley, and Alsan; readings on labor history will include Boustan, Fishback, and Kantor; and readings on the Great Depression will increasingly include Fishback, Horace, Kantor, and Bernanke. The courses thereby serve first and foremost as introductions to the types of questions posed and methodologies employed by economic historians at the frontier of the discipline today, and less as ideologically driven interpretations of economic history.

There exists, however, considerable concordance between economic historical instruction in economics departments and in history departments when it comes to the Great Depression, with syllabi reading selections tending to support statist interpretations of the economic history of the 1930s. That is, theses emphasizing a “crisis of capitalism,” exacerbated by insufficient state involvement in economic management, and ultimately

resolved by the emergence of a more economically interventionist state. Thus, while recent high-quality applied micro work exploiting random variation in fiscal and monetary policy during the 1930s increasingly appears on graduate and advanced undergraduate reading lists, even economics department syllabi are often weighted toward older macro research by such scholars as Romer, Sachs, and Temin, and DeLong, which tend to favor a more Keynesian interpretation of the 1930s.

5 South America

Unfortunately, my sample of South American universities is at present extremely limited, and therefore any extrapolations must be treated with considerable caution. Two preliminary points, however, are worth noting. The first is that economic history appears to be a critical deficit in historical and economic instruction in the region, with few departments offering dedicated courses in the field. Second, where instruction in economic history is offered, the focus and reading content is disproportionately geared toward regional political and economic history. Pontifical Catholic University of Chile is perhaps illustrative. While the university's history and economics departments combined offer six courses in or related to economic history, half of these focus on South America's unique history. Moreover, there appear to be deficits in the literature covered. A course entitled "Introduction to European Political Economy: From Feudalism to Multilevel Government," for instance, does not include the seminal work of North and Weingast, though does include readings of more statist scholars such as Rodrik. A course on the history of economic thought, meanwhile, uses post-Keynesians Colander and Landreth for course texts. At Universidade de Brasilia, similarly, history of economic thought is taught by Mauro Boianovsky, of the Brazilian post-Keynesian school of economic thought.

6 Europe

Teaching of economic history and the history of economic thought in Europe is prevalent, especially in the United Kingdom. Compared to departments in the United States, economics and history departments in the United Kingdom afford much more attention to research and teaching in economic history, with many universities including an economic history course among their core modules for both undergraduate and graduate economics students. Moreover, in contrast to U.S. departments, U.K. departments are generally somewhat less focused on identification in economic history, and instead relatively value original archival research and descriptive data. The result, however, is similar, in that a focus on empirical evidence typically translates into a balanced treatment of the history of capitalism and an overall positive assessment of the role of markets.

As evidence of the greater weight placed on economic history and the history of economic thought at U.K. universities, the London School of Economics even has a distinct Department of Economic History, offering undergraduate degrees in Economic History, Economic History with Economics, and Economics with Economic History, and graduate degrees in Economic History. These degree programs include modules on the history of economic thought taught by Mary Morgan, offering broad surveys of the history of economics, including readings on Smith, Ricardo, and the other classical economists, Marx, the Marginal Revolution, Keynes, Hayek, Friedman, and contemporary economics. Backhouse and Spiegel as texts for the most part offer technical, apolitical overviews of the discipline. The department also offers courses focusing on regional economic history, including Latin America, South Asia, East Asia, and Africa, incorporating the latest empirical research on the history and long-run economic development of both advanced

and emerging economies in these regions. Additional courses in financial history include staple readings of Bernanke, Eichengreen, Kindleberger, Kehoe, Prescott, and Temin.

Though Oxford and Cambridge do not have independent departments in economic history, both host sizeable cross-departmental communities under the heading “Economic and Social History.” Undergraduate students at Oxford may take a degree in History and Economics, while students studying for the degree in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics or Economics and Management may likewise enroll in the extensive course offerings in economic and social history. Graduate students, meanwhile, may study for one- or two-year masters degrees in Economic and Social History. Courses are highly U.K.- and western Europe-centric, particularly from the Industrial Revolution on, though courses are also offered on the economic history of Africa, Asia, Australia and the United States.

At Oxford, though Deborah Oxley and Jane Humphries’ research and teaching interests take a more skeptical view of the benefits of industrialization and the rise of the factory system, their research and syllabi are rooted in careful analysis of primary sources and anthropometric data, in particular utilizing height data to analyze changes in childhood nutrition over the course of the nineteenth century. Similarly, whereas the senior economics cohort of Knick Harley and Robert Allen adhered more to a relative factor prices interpretation of the Industrial Revolution, their replacement by James Fenske, who now teaches the “British Economic History since 1870” and “Economic History I: The Great Divergence” modules, has brought a renewed focus on the institutional and cultural development economics literature. Readings thus include not only Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson, but also Hornbeck, Alesina, Easterly, and Nunn, among others. The other junior faculty member, Rui Esteves, focuses on technical analysis of global capital flows during the pre-1914 era of globalization.

Among other U.K. universities offering instruction in economic history, Queens University Belfast especially has assembled a very strong cohort of seven, highly

technically trained faculty members who specialize in economic and/or financial history, led by John Turner, whose early research focused on free banking and more recent research addresses the historical role of regulation in contributing to banking sector instability. The University of Warwick, University of Glasgow, University of Edinburgh, and St. Andrew's also have sizeable faculty contingents specializing and offering instruction in economic history, with the latter three all offering undergraduate and postgraduate degrees in economic history or joint economics and history programs.

On the continent, available syllabi suggest economic history instruction in Germany is highly technical. For example, the recently Harvard-trained Davide Cantoni, at the University of Munich, offers courses in "Advanced Economic History" and "Culture and Institutions in Economic History." These courses analyze the relative roles of geography, institutions, and culture in determining long-run economic growth, and include numerous readings not only of Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (though this trio heavily populates the course syllabi), but also North, Greif, Nunn, McCloskey, Mokyr, and Crafts. Matthias Blum's course in agricultural economic history at Technische Universitat Munchen is more focused on geographic interpretations of long-run economic growth, and thus includes numerous readings of Diamond and Allen, but the emphasis is primarily on introducing students to quantitative and empirical methods in economic history.

In contrast to economic history instruction in the U.K. and Germany, there appears to be more of an emphasis in Spain and Portugal on books over articles, and a greater attention to regional economic history. Clark, Cameron and Neal, Broadberry and O'Rourke, Findlay and O'Rourke, Allen, and Eichengreen thus feature disproportionately on syllabi at, for example, Complutense University of Madrid, University of Lisbon, University of Valencia, and University of Zaragoza. Lains and Pinilla likewise feature prominently on the economic history of the European periphery. More generally, there appears to be relatively greater attention paid to core-periphery interpretations of

economic history, and relatively less attention paid to the more recent research in institutional and cultural economics, and the exploitation of quasi-natural experiments in economic history. Given the limited sample, however, more work is required to draw firmer conclusions about patterns of economic history instruction outside the U.K.

7 Africa, Asia, and Oceania

As is the case with my sample of South American universities, my sample of Asian, African, and Oceanic universities is extremely limited, to the extent that extrapolation is not yet possible. Stellenbosch University in South Africa has a strong faculty contingent specializing in economic history, and offers courses in the field at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, focusing on the latest empirical research in institutional economics by the likes of Acemoglu, Johnson, Robinson, Hornbeck, Nunn, Fenske, Dell, Mokyr, de Vries, Sokoloff, Engerman, Calomiris, and other current economists working in economic history. The University of Capetown does not offer courses in economic history, but does offer a module on the history of economic thought, covering pre-modern economic thought; Mercantilism; Physiocracy; the classical political economy of Smith, Malthus and Ricardo; socialist economic thought and Marx; utilitarianism, marginalism and the rise of neoclassical economics; the German historical school: Keynes and Keynesian economics; and the modern institutional school of thought, such as evolutionary, institutionalist, post-modern and ecological approaches.

Having retired from the University of Oxford, Robert Allen now teaches economic history at New York University-Abu Dhabi, though his syllabi tend to adhere to an older-school economic history literature, rather than the latest empirical research from top tier economics general interest and field journals. The University of Adelaide, which previously had a strong post-Keynesian historian of economic thought in the person of

Geoff Harcourt, now offers just one undergraduate course in economic history. In sum, instruction in economic history outside of Europe and the Americas seems to be quite varied, and additional observations are required in order to draw any substantive, general conclusions. Similarly, at the University of New South Wales, the departures of David Meredith and Deborah Oxley appear to have left a department formerly strong in economic history with no current course offerings at either the undergraduate or graduate levels.

8 Concluding Remarks

As noted in section 1, I find that, in contrast to when *Capitalism and the Historians* was published, the teaching of economic history today is on the whole more favorable to the historical role of relatively free markets in generating the requisite conditions for long-run economic development and rising living standards. I attribute this in part to the renewed research interest in economic history that has resulted from the explosion of historical data now available to historians and economists thanks to digitization. Not only, I suggest, has this allowed for more thorough empirical investigations of historical economic changes, it has also attenuated the scope for theory or ideology to sustain tenuous historical hypotheses. I further find that, regardless of the merits or flaws of the work of Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson, their prodigious research agenda has, building upon the seminal work of Douglas North, redirected attention among historians and economists alike to the importance of “inclusive” economic and political institutions, and the pernicious and persistent effects of rent-seeking and “extractive” institutions. This reorientation in the focus of economic history research has encouraged, particularly through the exploitation of natural experiments in history, the identification of inferior economic outcomes as consequences primarily of inferior institutions and their persistence

through non-market channels, rather than of “capitalism.” Course syllabi reveal that in many regions and at many universities, this shift in the research agenda of the field is rapidly being incorporated into historical instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

However, I also find that there is non-trivial departmental and regional variation in the substance of instruction in economic history and the history of capitalism. Economic history as taught in economics departments or in explicitly interdisciplinary programs, particularly in North America and Europe, are generally more likely to focus on quantitative empiricism, and thus seem to be relatively less dictated by pre-conceived theoretical or ideological suppositions. Second, whereas syllabi for courses in economic history in the United States, United Kingdom, and Germany typically include a significant number of articles from top general interest economics journals, as well as top field journals in economic history and development, that generally casts markets and “inclusive” economic and political institutions in a positive light, course syllabi in the rest of continental Europe and South America are more heavily weighted toward regional historical literatures which are often less favorable to markets.

The results of this survey do, therefore, suggest that while economic history on the whole may be experiencing a renaissance, relative to its status within the academy through the 1980s and 1990s, and while in the process economists may increasingly be recognizing the role of particular institutional arrangements in throttling or facilitating the productive capacity of market economies, there remains a tension between capitalism and the historian proper. Though Hayek, in his editor’s introduction to *Capitalism and the Historians*, was principally alarmed by the alleged ideologically-driven pessimism of historians toward the Industrial Revolution, Ashton identified a perhaps more profound cause for concern. In the first objection, he wrote, “Against commonly accepted views of the economic developments of the nineteenth century is concerned with their pessimism,

my second is that they are not informed by any glimmering of economic sense.” Thus, he argued, questions which even a cursory understanding of the concept of general equilibrium would reveal to require marginal analysis are instead often elided “with some such comment as that ‘a crisis arose’ or that ‘speculation became rife,’” or that “trade can arise only when there is a surplus or that investment abroad takes place only when the capital market at home is sated.”

The problem consequently remains, as when Ashton was writing, of a common tendency among historians of capitalism to engage in aggregation and abstraction, rendering deliberate violence to any concept of the individually optimizing behavior of real people, in real historical markets, which marginal conditions imply. Traded commodities (cotton, sugar), factors of production (capital, labor), and, indeed, “capitalism” itself, thereby acquire historical agency, allowing the historian to evade any serious engagement with the particular institutional, social, and cultural contexts within which market interactions at the micro level were historically embedded. The “law of profit” or the “logic of capitalism,” a history student may thus often learn, are acceptable explanations of historical change. This is an unfortunate abdication of responsibility, since neither will the economics student of the history of capitalism be offered adequate instruction in how methods and models must be modified to accommodate diverse historical circumstances (as the cautious historian will often complain of the latest econometric take on a question of historical nature).

There are, I would contend, three possible remedies. The first, given that the methods and models of economics appear to tend to provide a more hospitable environment for market-based thinking, would be the introduction of more history into economics instruction. This, unfortunately, is a non-starter, given that outside the explicitly interdisciplinary economic history programs in the United Kingdom, economics departments remain—for reasons which lie beyond the scope of this paper—deeply allergic

to even remotely qualitative analysis. The second potential remedy—namely, genuine interdisciplinary collaboration—is as unlikely in practice as it is trite in suggestion. The third and only viable alternative, therefore, is for the theories and tools of economics to be brought into history. The historically trained economic historian and the historian of capitalism, that is, should be equipped at a minimum with undergraduate-level micro- and macroeconomic theory, and practically instructed in the standard methods of econometrics. Ideological claims in economic history and the history of capitalism might then be at least partially constrained by the requirement that they be subject to the possibility of falsification.

Appendix A: Sample Universities

North America:

Brown University (USA)

Chapman University (USA)

Colgate University (USA)

College of Saint Benedict & Saint John's University (USA)

Columbia University (USA)

Cornell University (USA)

Dartmouth College (USA)

Emory University (USA)

George Mason University (USA)

Harvard University (USA)

Keene State College (USA)

Macalester College (USA)

McGill University (Canada)

Northwestern University (USA)

Princeton University (USA)

Rutgers University (USA)

Simon Fraser University (Canada)

St. John's University (USA)

Stanford University (USA)

State University of New York, Oswego (USA)

Stonehill College (USA)

University of Alberta (Canada)

University of Arizona (USA)
University of California, Berkeley (USA)
University of California, Davis (USA)
University of California, Los Angeles (USA)
University of California, Riverside (USA)
University of Delaware (USA)
University of Illinois, Chicago (USA)
University of Maryland, Baltimore County (USA)
University of Missouri, St. Louis (USA)
University of Southern California (USA)
University of Texas, Austin (USA)
University of Toronto (Canada)
University of Utah (USA)
University of Victoria (Canada)
University of Virginia (USA)
University of Wisconsin, La Crosse (USA)
University of Wisconsin, Madison (USA)
Vanderbilt University (USA)
Wabash College (USA)
Western Washington University (USA)
Yale University (USA)

Europe:

Complutense University of Madrid (Spain)

ETH Zurich (Switzerland)

King's College London (UK)

London School of Economics and Political Science (UK)

Queen's University (UK)

Technische Universität München (Germany)

Umeå University (Sweden)

University of Edinburgh (UK)

University of Glasgow (UK)

University of Lisbon (Portugal)

University of Munich (Germany)

University of National and World Economy (Bulgaria)

University of Oxford (UK)

University of Pompeu Fabra (Spain)

University of Paris-Sud (France)

University of Southern Denmark (Denmark)

University of St Andrew's (UK)

University of Valencia (Spain)

University of Warwick (UK)

University of Zaragoza (Spain)

University of Zurich (Switzerland)

South America:

Pontifical Catholic University (Chile)

University of Brazil (Brazil)

University of Buenos Aires (Argentina)

University of the Republic (Uruguay)

Rest of World:

New York University, Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates)

Stellenbosch University (South Africa)

University of Adelaide (Australia)

University of Capetown (South Africa)

University of Melbourne (Australia)

University of New South Wales (Australia)

University of Tokyo (Japan)