Scandia introducerar

History & Policy
– en introduktion

Henrik Rosengren

Debatten kring humanioras kris, dess orsaker och lösningar har varit ett återkommande tema på kultursidor, konferenser och i tidskrifter de senaste åren. Helt nyligen har diskussionerna fått nytt bränsle i tankeväckande böcker som *Alltings mått. Humanistisk kunskap i framtidens samhälle* (Sverker Sörlin och Anders Ekström, Stockholm 2012) och *Till vilken nytta? En bok om humanioras möjligheter* (red. Tomas Forser och Thomas Karlsohn, Göteborg 2013).

Utlösande för katastroflarmen, som det åtminstone i några sammanhang uttryckts som, har varit neddragningar av resurser till humanistiska ämnen, färre studenter, minskat antal utexaminerade forskare inom de humanistiska disciplinerna men framför allt en allmänt njugg och i värsta fall nedlåtande attityd till humanioras samhällsrelevans. I förstone kan det breda intresset för historia som kan skönjas i mängden populärvetenskapliga historietidskrifter, tv-program och tv-serier och utbudet av böcker om andra världskriget, kungar och krig möjligtvis visa på en motbild till den dystra profetian om humanioras död. Men den typ av nytta som historieämnet i detta fall har, som en källa till underhållning, identifikation och eskapism, kan inte motivera ett ickekommersiellt upplyftande av dess status. Pudelns kärna rör humanioras betydelse för samhällsutvecklingen.

Orsakerna till humanioras kris har huvudsakligen hänförts till två aspekter. För det första att ideal som premierat ett snävare, ekonomiskt nyttomaximerande där anställningsbarhet, mätbara resultat och evidensbaserat beslutsfattande kommit att dominera arbetsmarknaden, beslutsprocesser och vetenskapen i allt större utsträckning. I dessa sammanhang har humaniora uppfattats som en onödig, irrelevant sysselsättning. Något man gör "vid sidan om". För det andra har det framförts åsikter om att företrädarna för humaniora, alltså företrädesvis forskarna, ej förmått hävda sig i relation till en förändrad vetenskaplig, ekonomisk och kommunikativ verklighet. Historiker och andra humanister har helt enkelt suttit i sitt elfenbenstorn med armarna i kors och låtit förändringens tåg rusa förbi.

Men som Sverker Sörlin och Anders Ekström konstaterar ligger det något paradoxalt i att den humanistiska kunskapen ifrågasätts. De processer som sägs vara typiska för samhället av i dag; global kommunikation, vidgad

offentlighet, gränsöverskridande och gränssättning och så vidare är just
områden som exempelvis historiker ofta sysselsatt sig med och därigenom
har kompetens att reflektera över. Förändringarna borde således snarare
vara till gagn för den humanistiska forskningen.

Debatten om humanioras kris är förstås inte enkom ett svenskt feno-
men. Internationellt har en mängd litteratur utkommit som berör samma
problematik. Det finns också exempel på att diskussionen övergått till
handling. Ett sådant är nätverket History & Policy som *Scandia* har glädjen
att presentera i detta nummer. Här har ett antal historiker klivit ner från
elfenbenstornet och på ett handlingskraftigt och aktivt sätt konstruerat en
plattform för ökad allmän varseblivning av historieämnets samhällsnytta.
Tillika har nätverkets företrädare stimulerat till konkreta kontakter mellan
historiker, beslutsfattare och opinionsbildare. Kort sagt – ett initiativ till
lösning av humanioras kris.

History & Policy startades 2002 som en webbsida av två historiker från
Cambridge University, Simon Szreter och Alastair Reid i samarbete med
Pat Thane och Virginia Berridge. I dag har History & Policy utvecklats till
ett internationellt nätverk med 500 anslutna historiker och med en egen fast
institutionell bas på Institute of Contemporary British History vid King's
College i London, där man också bedriver undervisning på master- och
forskarnivå.

History & Policy arbetar för bättre *public policy* genom att öka förståelsen
för värdet av historisk kunskap. Med *policymaking* menar företrädarna något
bredare än bara politiskt beslutsfattande. Det handlar om att forma och
skapa agendor för en mängd samhälleliga aktiviteter och på olika arenor
inom politik, kultur och näringsliv. På nätverkets hemsida tillhandahåller
man två viktiga resurser för beslutsfattare, historiker och journalister; *policy
papers* och *opinion pieces*. Policy papers är sakkunniggranskade dokument
författade av professionella historiker som berör en mängd vitt skilda ämnen,
exempelvis situationen i Irak, klimatfrågan, barnomsorg etcetera. Opinion
pieces är debattinlägg om aktuella frågor författade av historiker utifrån
deras professionella sakkunskaper.

Mig veterligen är det första gången nätverket presenterar sin verksam-
het i ett svenskt sammanhang och förhoppningsvis kan artikeln leda till
ytterligare debatter kring historias samhällsrelevans. Det bör avslutnings-
vis nämnas att det finns ett liknande svenskt initiativ, som dock ännu är
i sin linda. Den helt nystartade svenska tankesmedjan Humtank har som
syfte att förändra forskningspolitiken och universitetens resursfördelning
till förmån för humaniora. Vidare vill man, likt History & Policy, delta i
samhällsdebatten och förändra allmänhetens attityd till de humanistiska
ämnena. Humtanks verksamhet kan följas på www.humtank.se.

History & Policy
A decade of bridge-building in the United Kingdom
Lucy Delap, Simon Szreter, and Paul Warde

The public value of the humanities

Debate about the 'public value' of the humanities has become a widespread phenomenon in recent years; an international discussion, although largely conducted within national borders. These debates are not so much related to the continual and evident demand for the output of the humanities, whether in the form of books, blogs, or television or radio documentaries, but more to the specific role they might play in shaping public life, and decision-making processes that involve our collective life.[1] In part, this trend is a response to the pressure of funding cuts and austerity, along with curriculum reform. Most subjects delivered in higher education have felt the need to justify both their position in the academy and a continued supply of funding for research and teaching. In the UK, the government has privileged the support for STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, and medicine), while at an undergraduate level, humanities degrees are now funded entirely by tuition fees paid by students. Subjects must now make a stronger case for why their students should take on large debts to study them.

The debate is also related to establishing the place of humanities disciplines in an age of 'evidence-based' policy, where government and business are placing increased emphasis on the development of metrics of performance, 'measurable outcomes', and accountability as determined by the practices of 'new public management'.[2] The Research Excellence Framework (REF) by which university departments are appraised and provided with government funding has imposed new requirements to demonstrate 'impact' and 'engagement'. Despite contributions to the 'creative industries', humanities subjects do not generally deliver easily assessed outcomes within this framework, in the shape of patents, data and technology, or vocational qualifications. The humanities disciplines have thus felt the need to justify themselves by developing more formal partnerships beyond academia (sometimes formalizing relationships that were in practice well established). Such activities also stimulate the co-funding of research by outside agencies. Equally, the main funding strands developed by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), such as 'Care for the Future' and 'Connected Communities', have

explicitly developed an instrumental and policy-orientated framework. Indeed, there was some controversy when the AHRC stipulated in 2010 that one of its strands for research funding would be 'the Big Society', a slogan adopted for electoral purposes by the incoming Conservative administration, and which has since been largely abandoned.[3]

However, the interest in the value of the humanities is not by any means simply reactive. Humanities scholars have also been actively seeking out new audiences, partners, and access to funding schemes, whether in the private or 'third' sector, or as delivered by government agencies and the European Union. This is manifested in demands that the 'human dimension' in research should not be limited to social scientists, and the assertion that the humanities have much to say about the development of research and policy related to the STEM subjects, or issues such as managing environmental change and sustainability. In the case of History as a subject, this is in many ways simply a restatement of the case that an understanding of what has happened in the past is an important contribution to public life, and represents a value that most people appreciate (although mostly in informal ways through their interpretation of national politics, the importance of communities to which they belong, or family life). It is an argument that has been repetitively made since Thucydides, but is now repeated in the context of twenty-first-century governance. There is a sense in which the humanities have not articulated their value (and values) sufficiently clearly or forcefully, especially in political life. Despite the fact that many politicians are preoccupied with historical antecedents and their own place in history, this has not been embedded in the procedures and habits they expect of public servants. Indeed, this lack has itself been expressed recently by Sir Robin Butler, ex-head of the civil service in the UK, who declared that every government department should have a 'resident' historian, not as a historian *of* the department, but because of the value of historical ways of thinking.[4]

In a policy context, the demand for greater incorporation of insights from history reflects the view of some that many tools for policymaking are not delivering as hoped. In turn, these views reflect a broader turn among some researchers towards more 'evolutionary' approaches since the 1980s, and in the case of economics and development studies, an increased focus upon institutional quality. It is recognized (at least by some) that institutional characteristics are the outcome of long historical processes that must be understood in order to better anticipate the likely impact of policy change.[5] Such factors are not easily shifted, but are not usefully understood by simplistic reduction to ingrained 'culture'. At the same time, history can provide insights into the origins of policy approaches themselves. Historical scholarship can show how tools developed for particular purposes (such as

cost–benefit analysis), or narratives entrenched in the assumptions of policy-makers, emerged at particular historical moments, shaping their application and limiting their view. Often the reasons for the original policy are long forgotten (such as the principles of selecting nature reserves that reflected reasons particular to scientific principles now decades old, or because of financial and legal constraints when conservation policy emerged).[6] History can enhance understanding of how policies have been framed according to historical circumstance, as a result of the preoccupations of the time. The past can continue to set an agenda even though the origins and reasons for doing things in such a way have been forgotten. History thus provides a means for reflection and renewal, as well as evidence that policy framing *can* change.

History and evidence

In a world of 'evidence-based' policy, what can history provide? History is a discipline infused with particularity, irony, and contingency, characteristics that might be an invitation to be standoffish. Historians like to operate, after all, with hindsight, and are often perceived as donnish and reserved. The instincts of the discipline are frequently to anticipate that a problem is more complex than anyone can easily perceive. This may predispose policy-makers to regard historical research and historians' comments on current issues as unhelpful, even if an expectation of the unanticipated is, in itself, a potential virtue for policymaking. Historical research is generally a mode of operation that itself requires time to produce outputs; often many years. This makes it poor at responding to the demands of policy production, especially in contrast to work in the social sciences, which is often designed with policy applications in mind. As policy work for historians is usually a spin-off from their core activity, they are generally not in a position to provide new information as it might be demanded. This means in practice that when historians are (rarely) consulted on policy change – often via the media rather than as part of a formalized process – their opinions are only pronounced when the policy development has largely taken place. They can only comment, late in the day, on the likelihood of success or failure, rather than contribute directly to policy formation in its initial stages.

Clearly an aspect of this situation is the way that historical knowledge has until recently not been produced with a view to incorporation in the policy process. In contrast, many other disciplines have explicitly orientated their output towards policy – for example, the report or working paper in economics, where exposure to criticism is seen as a cumulative addition to an established body of generally accepted theory (at least within that tradition).

Historians tend to present a unique synthesis, often produced by individuals, and so their prestige and output are less 'additive', and less frequently conceived of as lying in a common project. Historians have a consequently lesser expectation of redundancy as the research frontier advances. They perhaps take a greater degree of care – or one might say pedantry – in the form of their work: it is often longer, denser, less prescriptive, more qualified, and not well suited to digestion and incorporation into policy.

However, historians are a repository of a vast amount of information and knowledge – indeed, as a discipline, the terrain is simply everything that anyone has ever done that someone considered worthwhile recording and had the means to do so. Rather than being distant from an 'evidence base', historians might reasonably claim to be the evidence people par excellence. This policy-relevant evidence can be delivered in three main forms.

Firstly, historical evidence can provide *analogues* for thinking about problems, as tools derived from similar cases, although not necessarily similar topics: for example examining how behavioural change was achieved through the outlawing of smoking in the twenty-first century, or the adoption of smokeless fuels in the 1950s, in both cases long after the health risks became well known. Indeed, historians can also identify false analogies, such as the appeal often made to prompt action on climate change by positing its equivalence to the Second World War, an analogy that misunderstands both the range of actors involved, and how people actually behaved in the Second World War in response to measures such as rationing.[7]

Secondly, history can provide *direct evidence* of past circumstances. These might be studies that provide 'environmental baselines', such as indicators of biodiversity change over time, or the data provided by the History of Marine Animal Populations (HMAP) studies.[8] Often these are based on interdisciplinary teams conducting research using a wide array of techniques. Such evidence is not necessarily quantitative, and might relate, for example, to the history of the policy process itself and the lack of institutional memory within government departments. Such evidence can help to evaluate policies, and assess the various ways in which they might be implemented.[9]

Thirdly, and no less importantly if often overlooked, history can provide a specific *mode of thought* about issues. Its approach, as we have already seen, tends to anticipate complexity and work in a broadly synthetic manner, often integrating evidence that is different in kind, and developing intelligible narratives. Historians' work is informed by theory, but balances this with empirical material woven into an overall chronology, capable of critically assessing change or continuity over time.

This third quality is arguably the most important, although often least considered as a kind of evidence. Yet such forms of thinking are often required

to synthesize disparate data provided by a range of (sometimes competing) stakeholders and interests. Indeed, such synthesis may be a prerequisite of turning data into evidence by making causal connections and developing techniques for integration and comprehension. This is precisely what the able policymaker must do: weigh disparate views and forms of data. A cornerstone of good practice in historical study (which hindsight and irony can assist in teaching) is searching for the 'unknown unknown'. This openness and eclecticism does not mean that historians are vague in the handling of any particular piece of evidence or in the manner in which a corpus of data is built up. These tasks are often performed with extreme rigour and are subject to a high degree of peer scrutiny. Rather, historians work from the assumption that their evidence base is fragmentary and partial, even when using carefully constructed statistical samples. Indeed, they are often keenly aware of the problems inherent in data collection, and habitually investigate and reconstruct the way in which 'evidence' has been assembled.

However, the delivery of 'outputs' that focus on synthesis and narrative can lead to (at least) three common misunderstandings. Firstly, that history, and the humanities generally, are just about 'storytelling' and interpretation: they only deliver 'opinion', and indeed this is something that anyone can do. In fact the error is twofold; firstly to think that this is all that characterises historical study, and secondly to view these as insignificant skills, when in fact such techniques infuse all approaches to the comprehension of information. The second and related misunderstanding is that historians (and humanities scholars) are mere handmaidens to the purveyors of 'real' information – that they are specialists in the mere matter of communication rather than conceptualization, 'humanizing' science for example and making it understandable for a wider audience. This is the policy model where the historian is asked to 'make sense' or 'provide context' for a policy already decided on by others, or the writer 'translates' scientific work for a lay audience. The third common misunderstanding (ironically, given the second) is that historians themselves purvey mere 'information' about the past that should be delivered to people who really are in a position rigorously to model social processes and develop policy. In this view, historians are simply technicians who collect data from the archives and deliver them to more rigorous analysts who understand the need for time depth to their studies, and can turn historical data into models and prescriptions. Certainly historians can and do play this role. Yet historians themselves do not lack rigour or the capacity to model the information they have: demographic historians, for example, do not fundamentally operate in a way any different from demographers in their applications of statistics. Equally, there is no real distinction between 'interpretative' history versus other disciplines more

based on metrics and 'solid' experimental results. The core data of many historical studies – life events, levels of educational attainment, changes in wellbeing, canvases of 'public opinion' – are no more or less a matter for interpretation than they are in today's national statistical offices. Where the data is appropriate, historians equally apply metrics and hypothesis testing. For example, a recent collaborative project among historians and economists has been testing 'genuine savings' theory as a possible indicator of sustainable development employed by the World Bank using long-run historical data.[10]

The preceding sections have provided some detailed discussion of the potential place of history in public life, and indeed the nature of historical investigation itself. But there is, to begin with, a rather simple case to be made for the role of history in policy. Appeals to history are a regular, ubiquitous feature of political debate. Why then are professional historians largely absent from policy discussion? The History & Policy project began with a very simple premise: that policymaking will be more effective and critical if informed by serious historical scholarship.

Why History & Policy?

History can be studied in many ways and for many reasons, including the sheer pleasure of learning about other times, people, and places for their own sake. One of the values of history in a liberal democracy can be to inform the deliberative process of policymaking.[11] However, busy policymakers, immersed in the advice proffered by economists, sociologists, psychologists, and medical professionals, while also keeping an eye on the electoral weather vane, will not have the time, even if they do have the inclination, to become regular readers of academic history. If they do, it may well be considered as a leisure activity rather than one that contributes directly to their work.

Historians can grumble among themselves about this absence of genuine historical 'literacy' among the governing class (although studying history or other humanities degrees at university is actually quite common) and lament the general lack of a critically informed historical perspective among opinion leaders and political figures. But are they entitled to do so? If historians do nothing to make the fruit of their historical research accessible to those working in contemporary policy discussion and formulation, who is at fault? Indeed, if many policymakers *have* studied history at some point in their education, why do they not recognize the knowledge and skills they acquired as being of continuing relevance? The practical challenge for historians is therefore twofold: they have to communicate the value of history to a policy audience; then, if this is accepted, they must persuade policymakers to listen to and act on these historical insights.

In the UK, there has been an almost complete absence of any institutionalized vehicle for the communication of historians' research to this important audience. Apart from the possibility of occasional features in the broadsheets, there has been no recognized outlet for publicizing the fruits of historical research in a way that will speak to policymakers. There is consequently a considerable gap between, on the one hand, the monograph or learned article and, on the other hand, the 'popularizing' or 'public' history seen in television series or popular literature (often written by writers who, for all their merits, are not active in the research community). None of these outlets are designed to bring historians' specialized research specifically to the attention of the policy community, and none are much help to time-pressured policy advisers and policymakers who require focused historical knowledge or the kind of insight that can come from discussion 'on the hoof'. Thus by presenting history in an accessible form in a public forum where policy is debated, historians can also provide an introduction to historical perspectives on current political problems and examples of historicist ways of thinking about causation, evidence, context, and process in human affairs. This will provide a healthy counterweight to the preponderance of largely unhistorical theories, models, and projections that characterize the kind of policy advice offered by other influential disciplines.

These insights are the rationale behind History & Policy (<www.history-andpolicy.org>): what is needed is a process of making academic history digestible, not just to non-academics generally, but to policymakers specifically. This is best thought of as a two-way process, which necessitates an understanding of policymakers' needs, for it requires both new forms of output, but over time, personal interaction, training, and mutual understanding.

What is History & Policy?

History & Policy began as a website in 2002, edited by two historians at the University of Cambridge, Simon Szreter and Alastair Reid. Pat Thane of the Institute of Historical Research and Virginia Berridge of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine were also closely involved in the founding and development of the project. History & Policy's remit was to publish short, accessible articles aimed at non-historians (no footnotes has been an enduring rule!), summarizing and drawing out the contemporary policy implications of high quality, recent historical research. In 2006, a History & Policy external relations office was established at the Centre for Contemporary British History at the Institute of Historical Research, with initial funding from the US-based Philanthropic Collaborative and a second phase of funding from Arcadia and the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation.

History & Policy moved from funding arrangements based on grants and donations to a permanent institutional base at the Institute of Contemporary British History at King's College, London in 2013. This has provided opportunities for input into teaching at the postgraduate level, introducing MA and doctoral students to thinking broadly about the uses of history. The MA module in History and Policy-making sets out the policymaking field and major theories and thinking about how decisions are made in government. Visiting speakers, ranging from official historians at the Foreign Office to former civil servants, have introduced specific topics where history has usefully informed contemporary policy. Students have been able to draw on the archive of papers on the History & Policy site to evaluate a range of interventions by historians, and have begun to develop the skills needed to frame their own research as an intervention in public life. Their work is assessed through the drafting of a policy paper similar to those published on the site – taking a specific policy issue and showing how historical perspectives can inform contemporary options. This study option at the MA level has also led to experiments in the provision of short periods of work for students, organized around a specific historical theme, within government, NGOs, and museums. This helps provide them with a greater understanding of how these institutions work, and practical experience in introducing historical elements to the work of organizations, as well as enhancing student employability. Policymaking is thus broadly defined as an activity that shapes and develops the agenda of a wide set of institutions, and is certainly not limited to central government. Local and devolved government, think tanks, the private sector, and heritage organizations are all sites where historical scholarship can be brought to bear.

Since its initial launch, History & Policy as a partnership and network has expanded considerably. The network now comprises an increasing number of professional historians (over 500 by January 2014) who have agreed to make themselves and their expertise available for consultation by policymakers and the media. This network in turn is a source of the growing number of policy articles that policymakers can draw on. For instance, following the publication of his History & Policy paper on *Rationing returns: A solution to global warming*[12] and the associated publicity in the press, Mark Roodhouse of the University of York was invited to submit a memorandum to the parliamentary Environmental Audit Select Committee inquiry into personal carbon allowances.

The complementary half of the network comprises individuals working in the print, news, radio, and television media, in Parliament and the civil service, in think tanks and NGOs who wish to be kept abreast of the publications appearing on the website and the increasing range of History &

Policy events, seminars, and conferences, organized to engage audiences from the policy world with historians. The very first such event was a debate on pensions policy held at the House of Commons, chaired by Frank Field and attended by James Purnell MP, then Minister of State for Pensions Reform, and Nigel Waterson MP, his Conservative shadow.[13] History & Policy's official launch in December 2007 was another event of this kind, taking place at the Churchill War Cabinet Museum in Whitehall under the title 'Why Policy Needs History' with an audience of over 140 academics, politicians, civil servants, journalists, and members of think tanks and charities. The event stimulated widespread public discussion and media coverage in *The Times*, the *Guardian*, and *The Independent*, as well as interviews on television and BBC Radio 4's *Today* and *Start the Week* programmes.[14]

However, reading or hearing a new argument once is unlikely to be enough to change deeply entrenched ideas about the present and assumptions about the past. In most fields of activity, regular interaction and gradual familiarization with new ideas is usually required to bring about a real transformation of understanding. The ad hoc nature of the early interactions between historians and policymakers led to exciting events, but few follow-ups, and little demonstrable change in how policy is made. Increasingly over the eleven years of its operations, the History & Policy project has sought ways to embed its thinking in ongoing initiatives based in specific government departments, focusing on regular, interactive exchanges. This includes panel discussions featuring multiple historians (whose views might well conflict with one another); sessions on historical skills such as assessing evidence; interactive training courses; and informal networking. By developing sustained relationships, often through support at the highest levels of government departments, it has been possible for civil servants to help formulate themed seminar series – such as the Treasury's series of 2013, examining the policy and public spending implications of major areas of social change such as ageing or energy use. As an established and trusted stakeholder, History & Policy has also been responsive to sudden spikes of concern in the policy agenda. For example, it supported a workshop and report commissioned in 2011 by the Independent Panel on Forests and Woodlands, a body established by the Coalition government in the wake of its proposal to privatize the public forest estate. This has led to continued work, with History & Policy and AHRC-sponsored initiatives helping to maintain links between historians, and organizations working on forestry and tree conservation in government and the environmental and heritage sectors. Activities range from the provision of advice about the historic landscape, and sources for understanding ecological change, to insight into the way policy shifts may be achieved.[15]

Another avenue alongside these events located in specific government departments or in response to areas of sudden, pressing public concern has been the development of the 'policy forum', bringing together small numbers of key practitioners with relevant historical experts to see what would emerge from a series of regular discussions. It was expected from the outset that such interactions would not be one-way streets, but that the scholars involved would also learn from the practitioners' accounts of their experience and from observing their responses to different types of historical argument. The first group chosen was trade unionists, as the History & Policy founder Alastair Reid had recently published a general survey of the field. In the course of his work, he had come into contact with James Moher, a union legal official with a long track record of experience in different types of unions and a Ph.D. in history. (This reflects a common experience that a 'foot in the door' of the public policy world is assisted by someone with a history education and a reasonable degree of seniority in the organization.) Trade Union Forum sessions since have examined such subjects as postwar collective bargaining, trade union political funding (marking the anniversary of the landmark 1909 Osborne Judgement), and the impact of the 1984–5 miners' strike. It is clear that there is an appetite for this sort of discussion among policymakers, but also that it takes time to build up an effective mix of historians and practitioners, to create an atmosphere of familiarity and trust, and to establish a shared framework of historical and intellectual reference points resilient enough to permit the exploration of new ideas. This need for the patient building-up of relationships suggests that having a constructive impact on public life is no different from developing quality projects or interdisciplinary relationships within academia.

Another avenue for knowledge exchange has been to commission historians working on diverse areas to use their research to think about abstract, more general principles that may then be applicable to policy problems. An example of this has been the collaboration between History & Policy and the environmental pressure group Friends of the Earth (FoE). At a 2013 invitation-only workshop, seven historians from the History & Policy network used case-studies ranging from the nineteenth-century abolition of slavery to the military defeat of Singapore in 1942 to inform debate on a key strategy question for FoE: 'How does change happen?' Historians are uniquely oriented to charting and explaining change over time, particularly when they pool their expertise and work collaboratively. In drawing up their campaigning priorities, FoE found an integrated, informal discussion of the political, social, and economic factors that make change possible or unlikely at different historical moments to be highly productive. It contributed to widening their sense of what might be possible in campaigning

for sustainable lifestyles, and identified patterns and possible ways in which purchase could be gained in seeking success for 'visions for an alternative future'. The salience of history does not necessarily come from providing direct analogies with contemporary affairs, but can instead arise from its ability to discern patterns, risks, and long-standing tendencies that might accelerate or delay change.

Despite these many areas, the main instrument of History & Policy remains its website. At time of writing it carries almost 160 policy papers classified into 20 searchable categories ranging from 'Climate change and Environment' to 'Families and children', 'Economy, taxation and finance', and 'International Affairs and Security'. History & Policy has also worked with the BBC journalist Chris Bowlby to publish a monthly feature on topical issues in the *BBC History Magazine*, where articles often have a wider appeal – in the context of scandals over expenses and disenchantment with Westminster politics in the UK, articles have included 'Have we lost the spirit of the hustings' and 'Did we ever have trust in our MPs?'.[16] The website also features shorter opinion articles and 'rapid responses' (over 140), both of which encourage and allow historians to react quickly to topical events such as the Budget or the Queen's speech.[17] History & Policy has also used its website to run an occasional myth-busting 'Bad History' feature, originally modelled on Ben Goldacre's influential 'Bad Science' columns in the *Guardian*, in partnership with *Times Higher Education*.[18] All History & Policy activity is promoted in its quarterly newsletter and the social media, where it has a substantial following; indeed, the new prominence of social media such as Twitter in setting the news agenda has meant that older methods of engaging with public and policy audiences have been transformed. Rather than press releases, targeted tweets using well-researched hashtags, live tweeting, or 'storify' summaries of events can have a significant effect on reaching wider audiences. Tweets and Facebook have raised papers' viewings from a baseline of around 7 page-views a day (without publicity) to spikes of 200 page-views – though this effect is short-lived, and must be evaluated to assess whether visits are brief or sustained.

This is an area of innovation where historians who seek public engagement must keep abreast of new tools and techniques. It is likely to mean that projects with a digital component must diversify their content in order to encompass new genres such as podcasts, animation, and online lectures. Websites can no longer function as convenient sites for publishing text, but must engage and interact with users. While new forms of content can run the risk of reducing nuanced, complex scholarship to sound bites and clichés, this is not a necessary outcome. Graphs, visual and other primary sources, animation, and cartoons can tell complex stories and add to historical

analysis by creating multiple entry points. New media offer a significant opportunity for engagement that must be seriously considered. Reflecting these new ways of working, History & Policy has in 2013 engaged a digital communications officer, based at the University of Cambridge and working full time alongside the public affairs manager at King's College London, which has allowed for an innovative web redesign and a more integrated social media strategy that can empower policy-oriented historical scholarship through advances in the digital humanities and technologies.

What is intellectually distinctive about the History & Policy initiative is its ambition to bring to the notice of policymakers and the wider public an understanding of the implications for contemporary public policy discourse of any and all kinds of historical research and of the historical perspective. It is not therefore a vehicle for research exclusively on 'policy history', the history of previous government policies in various branches of government. This may be part of History & Policy's remit, but only a part, and it is certainly no substitute for academic research that focuses on this sub-field and is addressed, notably, by the separate *Journal of Policy History*. Nor does History & Policy attempt to promote narrowly conceived, instrumental, policy-relevant research among historians, with all the attendant, unhistoricist problems of presentism, anachronism, teleology, and selectivity. While it aims to make historians more responsive to the needs of practitioners in the policy field, its core task remains facilitating access to research that historians conducted for its academic merit, and which, importantly, has been peer-reviewed and its academic quality acknowledged by the profession.

The broad remit of History & Policy means that in contrast to many equivalent policy-oriented, knowledge-exchange projects, it not only reaches out beyond 'policy history', but also beyond a contemporary or modern focus. Straying into the premodern can seem counter-intuitive for policymakers, more used to a resolutely future or present-oriented focus. One recent British home secretary, Charles Clarke, notoriously dismissed medieval history in 2003 as 'ornamental', and few in government look back beyond (at best) six or seven decades.[19] Yet History & Policy has found it productive to look back further than most policymakers would choose. As John Arnold has argued, the premodern can disrupt claims made about what is 'natural' or 'traditional', and can broaden our sense of possibility in ways that *can* have purchase in contemporary debates.[20] Peter Borsay, for example, looked at the early eighteenth century and its panic over gin drinking to help understand the fears associated with modern binge drinking.[21] Lorie Charlesworth turned to the Elizabethan Poor Law, and its establishment of rights to relief from poverty, to consider contemporary debates about welfare reform.[22] While there may be significant barriers to providing succinct historical analogies

or commentary rooted in the distant past, the experiences of History & Policy suggest that this is worth pursuing, and that premodern history can be as relevant to policy as modern or contemporary scholarship.

History & Policy is run by and for professional historians, and thus shares with them the premise that valuable history is based on research that must, first and foremost, attempt to engage critically with the records and texts of the past on their own terms. Having done the painstaking historical research, we believe that the fruits of historians' labours merit being shared more widely. Historians generate important new knowledge and challenging, often disconcerting, insights, which can change perceptions of the nature of current policy issues and expand the imagination of today's policymakers. Without this, the policy process can remain trapped by unexamined and misleading assumptions about the present and how it came to be. Policies for change in the future are much more likely to bring about their intended outcomes if formulated on the basis of an informed, open, and critical perspective on the past.

History in policy in practice

The strongest general argument both for the importance of bringing history into dialogue with policy and policymaking and for historians to take it as their social duty to bring about this expansion in contemporary public discourse, is that history is already there, all the time, in the policy-formulating process. The only question is what *kind* of history is going to be used by decision-makers.

Without the explicit input of critical and reflexive professional historians, the 'history' that policymakers use is likely to be naïve, simplistic, and implicit, often derived from unconscious assumptions or vague memories from lessons in school. As such, it is likely to be highly selective, used to suit predetermined purposes, and largely unverified. The (ab)use of history in this form not only represents a problem of commission but also of omission, in that it both invokes 'bad' history and denies the policy process the vast reservoir of imaginative and critical resources available from contemporary historical research.

In 2007, Virginia Berridge carried out a study, funded by History & Policy, into the current use of history by policy advisers and decision-makers in the health policy field. Her conclusions deserve to be cited in full:

> My interviews reveal just this; that history is being used in an ad hoc way,
> mostly without the involvement of historians. Historians are mainly seen
> as providers of the raw materials for analysis. Policymakers like to use

history but they do not usually see historians or historical interpretation as a necessary part of the frame. There is little knowledge of the interpretative role of history, and views of history are dominated, in the view of historians, by out-of-date perceptions or by mistaken views of personalities and 'great men'. Despite the presence in the current [2007] government of many historically trained ministers, including a prime minister-in-waiting with a history Ph.D., the use of history as a tool to make better public policy is currently under-developed. In the health field, the past is mined for historical clichés to support current policies. The repetition of NHS folk histories has become a cottage industry among health ministers, while expert historians are excluded from policy discussion and the insights they could offer are wasted.[23]

Berridge's interviewees identified social scientists in policy positions and politicians with historical backgrounds as potential 'history brokers'. But, despite recognizing the value of history in policymaking, many civil servants and politicians operate in a historian-free environment, relying instead on 'folk histories' to interpret the past and inform decisions in the present.

Policymakers do not simply resort to ill-understood or half-remembered history, of course. They are subjected to a plethora of forms of knowledge from the economics, management, and policy science fields, which may appear to be predictive of specified outcomes (policy goals and their 'targets'), regardless of local contexts, and which purport to be sufficiently 'scientific' and powerful as to be relied upon for guidance by decision-making funders, officials, and ministers. They generate results that can be fitted relatively easily into the kinds of cost–benefit analysis that civil servants are legally required to provide, and translated into targets and deadlines for policy delivery. Yet this creates a self-defeating problem. Such forms of context-free policy science promise interventions that will supposedly negotiate the process of change without unforeseen consequences and reactions.

History, as we have seen, provides a way of thinking about society and its component parts, about the messy, conflicted, and negotiated process of change, and about the differences between perspectives of different agents. This disposition can potentially assist in the field of policy formulation and implementation, since policies of any kind have to be applied in particular contexts with their specific local conditions and history. History can also be a means to challenge the assumption, usually held more by 'laypeople' than scientists themselves, that scientists provide objective, factual advice, and that they all agree. As David Edgerton has demonstrated, even the UK government's science policy is itself based on erroneous historical assumptions. In presenting oral evidence to the parliamentary Select Committee

on Innovation, Universities, Science and Skills (arranged by History & Policy and the AHRC), Edgerton debunked 'invented traditions' such as the 'Haldane Principle' that have distorted science policy for generations; in doing so, Edgerton succeeded in bringing history into the frame when understanding government science policies.[24]

History can also offer policymakers imagination and inspiration. Historians are not just naysayers, whispering the counsel of complication. Historians themselves can too easily overlook the extent to which certain aspects of the past, which are familiar or even mundane to the historical specialist, can strike those facing policy problems in the present as a novel insight. Indeed, what is novel and inspiring to contemporary policymakers about a period in the past may have been known for some time to historians as the following example illustrates.

From history to policy – an example

In 1995, an important comparative article published in the specialist journal, *The Economic History Review*, by Peter Solar brought to the collective attention of the British historical profession the unusual nature of the English Poor Law's universality of provision. By the mid seventeenth century, it covered not only the urban poor, as found in many other parts of Europe, but also all the poor in every rural parish as well.[25] Solar argued that the development of this precocious, universalist social security system could have played a significant role in England's rapidly rising agricultural productivity and associated urbanization in the two centuries following its statutory creation by Elizabeth I.

Simon Szreter had long wondered about England's system of extensive parish registers and why they had been so assiduously kept and preserved that enough of them had survived for the Cambridge Group for the History of Population to mount its extraordinary exercise of historical demographic reconstruction in the 1970s and 1980s.[26] Solar's article helpfully suggested to him a possible interrelationship between these two institutions. After some further research on this, in 2007 he published an article in the policy-oriented journal, *World Development*, which primarily aimed to bring a historical perspective to bear on the contemporary issue of the scandalous neglect, from a Human Rights perspective, of identity registration at birth for about 36 per cent of the children born today in the world's poorest countries.[27] The historical contribution of this article was to point out how the citizens of England, the world's first successful 'developed' economy, had long benefited both from a universal identity registration system (the parish registers from 1538 onwards) and a universal social security system

(the 'old' Poor Law, 1601–1834), both incorporated into the parish as a basic unit of governance, as precursors to economic development. Whilst many other contemporary European societies developed the local registration of births, marriages, and deaths from the late medieval period on, none combined this with such a widely administered welfare system, combined within one institution, and given statutory backing.

Szreter's publication had at least three further significant policy-related consequences. Firstly, he was asked to join a large team of public health epidemiologists and social scientists, writing a commissioned set of articles on the current neglect of civic registration in the world's poor countries. They did not have a historian on the team and the *World Development* article drew their attention to the potential significance of incorporating a historical perspective into their work on this contemporary policy issue. He found that one of the main contributions was to counsel extreme care in advocating the creation of new identity registration systems in the world's poorest countries because they could be open to tragic abuse by maverick political regimes – as in Nazi Germany or Rwanda in the 1990s – and must therefore be designed with this risk in mind.

The team's work has borne fruit in a set of four articles in *The Lancet*'s online publication.[28] These, in turn, have been extensively cited in the final Report of the World Health Organization Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, chaired by Sir Michael Marmot, which included the admonitory statement that, 'Improving civil registration systems requires the trust and participation of citizens. Their privacy needs to be protected through functioning data protection systems. Individuals, in particular vulnerable groups, should be protected from abuse of civil registration by governments and others.'[29]

Secondly, Szreter was asked by the organisers to speak at a conference in Entebbe, Uganda, sponsored by the UK Department for International Development, on the practical problems with constructing social security systems in sub-Saharan Africa.[30] Clearly, this was well outside the comfort zone of a historian of modern Britain; however, what the conference organizers wanted was a tale of inspiration for an audience of hard-bitten contemporary social practitioners and decision-makers (including one of Uganda's treasury ministers, who was going to take a lot of persuading that money should be spent on welfare support for the poor rather than on 'productive' investment in roads, hospitals, schools, and so on).

Many in the audience, which included policymakers and practitioners from across the developing world, had no detailed knowledge of the historic English Poor Law, and some had never heard of it. Their main concern was to contemplate and discuss the mountain they would be attempting to scale

over the coming years and decades, firstly in trying to convince politicians and donors to implement ambitious and costly social protection schemes among the world's poorest, and secondly in getting to grips with very difficult practical problems such as developing systems for cash payments to HIV-AIDS-depleted households, sometimes headed by young children.

What they found helpful and inspirational was simply the fact that history showed that complex, large-scale welfare systems were not solely the property of rich nations, the luxurious fruit of development achieved. In a country such as early seventeenth-century England – which had been as poor in per capita GDP terms as sub-Saharan African countries today, which had literacy rates far below even those of the poorest African countries today, and which had been riven by religious division, and even open civil war, for decades – it had nevertheless been possible to construct and maintain a fully functioning, universal social security system and associated identity registration system.

For all historians of modern and early modern England, these historical facts are nothing new, and to reiterate them would not hold the attention of an audience at a professional early modern history conference. But for the development policy audience in Entebbe this was highly significant, new information. The detailed history of the Old Poor Law and its locally diverse modi operandi is, of course, the subject of lively and ongoing historical scholarship and debate.[31] This, too, can offer some stimulating analogies and insights for contemporary planners and policy-makers operating in the entirely distinct context of Africa today, though of course nobody would want to claim that the practicalities of Poor Law administration in England's early modern past can provide any precise template for practical and specific guidance. However, what is much more important to the policy practitioners in Africa today is simply to know of the elemental and undisputed fact of the old Poor Law's widespread existence in a 'poor' society and to ponder the pregnant fact that it long predated modern economic development and infrastructure.

Thirdly, the article in *World Development* was noticed by Nandan Nilekani, who cited it as the key authority in his book *Imagining India* when he proposed that 'Unique identification for each citizen also ensures a basic right – the right to "an acknowledged existence" in the country, without which much of a nation's poor can be nameless and ignored, and governments can draw a veil over large-scale poverty and destitution'.[32] The policy significance of this lies in the fact that Nilekani's proposal was promptly legislated by the Indian Parliament in 2009, with Nilekani himself appointed as Chairman of the Unique Identity Authority of India.

Conclusions

The historian's knowledge and historicist perspectives are valuable precisely because they provide challenging intellectual resources that are different to those available from other disciplines. As exemplified here in the case of contemporary civic registration policies, historical research and a historicist approach can – and should – provide policy practitioners, advisors, and decision-makers with admonition and inspiration in equal measure. The policy world uses history all the time, but it tends to be history of a highly selective, convenient, and amateur kind. The point of the History & Policy network is to challenge the sloppy application of evidence, or at least make it harder, by providing the professional alternative. History & Policy provides an innovative channel through which academics can present their historical research in relation to a current policy area.

This transfer of knowledge is not just one-way: the practice of studying history is of course a two-way dialogue between past and present. History & Policy believes that it can only be helpful for historians to be as critically well informed as possible about those aspects of the present that most pre-occupy the policy world. It keeps network members up to date with policy debates, particularly those that could benefit from historical reassessment. Historians are regularly asked to contribute to these debates, reinforcing the relevance of this two-way dialogue to both parties.

In 2009–2010, History & Policy completed an evaluation of its services amongst its network of professional historians. All of those interviewed believed that a source of support that linked historians and policymakers was probably or definitely important, and 93 per cent said the need for an organization like History & Policy was probably or definitely increasing.[33] Some network members believed History & Policy was important because the organization, by its very existence, reinforced the importance of history in policymaking and justified the attempts of historians to become more involved. Further, History & Policy was credited with having a real impact on policy. Network members have documented their research being incorporated into policy debates in a constructive fashion. Others have engaged in more critical ways, and comment on the opportunity to dispel self-serving myths and assumptions about the past, and to show how policy 'disasters' happened in the past. The process of policymaking has also been demonstrably broadened by this work. Following the successful seminar series initiated by History & Policy founder member Pat Thane at the Department of Education, the department created five new policy 'tests' in 2013 to govern policymaking. These guidelines asked civil servants to include historical perspectives and sources in how they frame and evaluate

policymaking, and have subsequently been promoted to other departments as an example of best practice.

In Britain, many will remember Tony Blair confidently pronouncing in his speech to the US Congress that, 'There has never been a time … when, except in the most general sense, a study of history provides so little instruction for our present day'.[34] In the spring of 2003, History & Policy published two papers (by Beverley Milton-Edwards and John W. Dower), which, in retrospect, were prescient in their warnings about the coalition's unrealistic approaches to winning the peace in Iraq.[35] These are among the most powerful papers on the H&P website, not because the authors adopted a radical political line, but simply because of their insistence on presenting a clear and full historical account to cross-examine current policies. The value of History & Policy lies in its role as an established, independent, and (as an organization) non-partisan channel through which to present accessible policy-relevant historical insights. History & Policy enables academics in the humanities to share more widely the value of their hard-won findings and insights, and those in the policy world genuinely interested in open debate to enhance their intellectual resources to deal with the very difficult problems they face.

In 2009, Baroness Onora O'Neill, former President of the British Academy, highlighted History & Policy in her oral evidence to a parliamentary select committee, saying, 'it would often be extremely useful if those who know what worked and what did not work in the quite recent past were there to say, "By the way, you tried this in 2002 and you gave it up for the following reasons"'.[36] Or, indeed, in 1902, or 1802 or even earlier. However, there is a long way to go before History & Policy achieves the kind of profile and acknowledged status enjoyed by some longer-established, policy-facing institutions. At the time of founding History & Policy, Alastair Reid and Simon Szreter considered the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) an excellent example to emulate. The latter is undoubtedly the most esteemed source of independent comment, and perhaps any comment, on the state of the British economy. While the field of historical knowledge is of course much more diverse and no less contested than the politics of taxation, the IFS showed that it was possible to establish a position of publicly respected authority and maintain a reputation for political impartiality and the highest professional standards. With far fewer resources (two full-time staff members and an academic director), it has been possible to establish a site of historical expertise that has the respect and trust of government. It is testament to the innovative nature of this approach that it has inspired similar projects overseas, including the Australian Policy and History network established in 2010.[37] We have learned that the skills and energy of communications

specialists are as vital to the effectiveness of this project in reaching its target audience in the policy world as the website with its high quality papers written by historians. History & Policy as a venture is still in the early stages of growth, though perhaps no longer in its infancy.

Summary

In this article, we examine the experience of History & Policy, (www.historyandpolicy.org), an organisation set up a decade ago in Britain to enable insights from academic historians to inform policymaking processes. We firstly address the manner in which historians can contribute to 'evidence-based' policymaking, both as providers of historical information as antecedents and analogues, and bringing specific skills in handling narrative, synthesis of diverse evidence, and communication. We then examine the work of History & Policy itself, in encouraging historians to make their specialised research available in a digestible form as policy papers, and reflecting on the significance of their own work for a broader audience. Surveying the organisation's own history, we consider the lessons learned from a decade of publication and developing face-to face ties with policymakers in government and elsewhere, and provide a case study of the influence of a historian's work on development policy relating to the issue of population registration. This leads to conclusions on the painstaking work of building up a profile and contacts, the importance of communications specialists in engaging with the contemporary policy world (and related media), and the contributions history can make to policy.

Notes

1   *The Public Value of the Humanities*, Jonathan Bate (ed.), London 2011; Helen Small, *The Value of the Humanities*, Oxford 2013; Stefan Collini, *What are Universities for?*, London 2012; John Armstrong, 'Reformation and Renaissance. New life for the Humanities', *Griffith Review* 2011:31, pp. 13–51; Tom Griffiths, 'The Humanities and an environmentally sustainable Australia', *Australian Humanities Review* 2007:43; Anders Ekström & Sverker Sörlin, *Alltings Mått. Humanistisk kunskap i framtidens samhälle*, Stockholm 2012. There were, of course, earlier interventions, such as Richard E. Neustadt & Ernest R. May, *Thinking in Time. The Uses of History for Decision Makers*, New York 1986; and Carl E. Schorske, *Thinking with History. Explorations on the Passage to Modernism*, Princeton 1998.

2   For a historical perspective, see Tony Cutler, 'A necessary complexity: History and public management reform', 2007, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-67.html>; on the Research Excellence Framework, see <http://www.ref.ac.uk/>.

3   *The Big Society Debate: A New Agenda for Social Welfare?*, Armine Ishkanian & Simon Szreter (eds.), Cheltenham 2012.

4 'Every department should have a historical adviser, argues Lord Butler of Brockwell', *Civil Service World*, 13 March 2013.

5 See for example *History, Historians and Development Policy. A Necessary Dialogue,* Chris A. Bayly, Vijayendra Rao, Simon Szreter & Michael Woolcock (eds.), Manchester 2011. Arguments about the importance of institutional structures and habits for development have long been established in economic history. For a recent example, see James A. Robinson & Daron Acemoglu, *Why Nations Fail. The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*, London 2013.

6 For example in the UK, see John Sheail, *Nature Conservation in Britain. The Formative Years*, London 1998.

7 Mark Roodhouse, 'Rationing returns: A solution to global warming?', 2007, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-54.html>.

8 <www.hmapcoml.org>; and see, for example, Enric Tello, Natàlia Valldeperas, Anna Ollés, Joan Marull, Francesc Coll, Paul Warde & Paul T. Wilcox, 'Looking backwards into a Mediterranean edge environment: Landscape changes in El Congost Valley (Catalonia), 1850–2005', *Environment & History* (forthcoming).

9 Sally Sheard, 'Doctors in Whitehall: Medical advisers at the 60th anniversary of the NHS', 2008, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-72.html>; Kevin Jefferys, 'On your marks… Formulating sports policy and Britain's Olympic legacy', 2012, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-133.html>; Peter J. Beck, 'History and Policy at work in the Treasury, 1957–76', 2006, <http://www.historyand-policy.org/papers/policy-paper-49.html>.

10 Eoin McLaughlin, Nick Hanley, Jan Kunnas, David Greasley, Les Oxley & Paul Warde, 'Testing Genuine Savings as a forward-looking indicator of future well-being over the (very) long-run', *Journal of Environmental Economics & Management* 2014, 67:2, pp. 171–188; Magnus Lindmark & Sevil Acar, 'Sustainability in the making? A historical estimate of Swedish sustainable and unsustainable development 1850–2000', *Ecological Economics* 2013:86, pp. 176–187.

11 This is one of the principal arguments of John Tosh, *Why History Matters*, Basingstoke 2008.

12 Roodhouse 2007.

13 This event marked the launch of *Britain's Pensions Crisis: History and Policy,* Hugh Pemberton, Pat Thane & Noel Whiteside (eds.), Oxford 2006.

14 For details of the media coverage, see 'Why policy needs history', <http://www.history-andpolicy.org/newsarchive/index.html#practice>.

15 Paul Warde & Erin Gill, 'Cultural and social issues affecting woodland and forest policy in England', Report from the workshop held at Nobel House, 30 September 2011; <http://www.defra.gov.uk/forestrypanel/files/Cultural-and-Social-Issues-affecting-Forest-Policy.pdf>; for an example of one collaboration, see, <http://www.quantockappleday.co.uk>.

16 Chris Bowlby, 'Changing times: Did we ever have trust in our MPs?', *BBC History Magazine,* September 2009, <http://www.bbchistorymagazine.com/feature/changing-times-did-we-ever-have-trust-our-mps>; Chris Bowlby, 'Changing times: Have we lost the spirit of the Hustings?', *BBC History Magazine*, January 2010, <http://www.bbchistorymagazine.com/feature/changing-times-have-we-lost-%E2%80%98spirit-hus-tings%E2%80%99>.

17 See <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/opinion/index.html>.

18 See <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/badhistory/index.html>; and Matthew Reisz, 'Past mistakes', *Times Higher Education*, 15 October 2009, <http://www.timeshigher-education.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=408693&c=2>.

19 'Clarke dismisses medieval historians', *The Guardian*, 9 May 2003.

20   John Arnold, 'Why history matters – and medieval history also matters', 2008, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-81.html>.

21   Peter Borsay, 'Binge drinking and moral panics: Historical parallels?', 2007, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-62.html>.

22   Lorie Charlesworth, 'England's early "Big Society": Parish welfare under the Old Poor Law', 2010, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-108.html>.

23   Virginia Berridge, 'History matters? History's role in health policymaking', 2007, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/docs/health_policymaking.pdf; and V. Berridge, 'History matters? History's role in health policy making', *Medical History* 2008:52, pp. 311–326.

24   See David Edgerton, 'The Haldane Principle and other invented traditions in science policy', 2007, <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-88.html>; and House of Commons Innovation, Universities, Science and Skills Committee, 2009.

25   Peter M. Solar, 'Poor relief and English economic development before the Industrial Revolution', *Economic History Review* 1995:48, pp. 1–22.

26   Edward A. Wrigley & Roger S. Schofield, *The Population History of England, 1541–1871*, Cambridge 1981.

27   Simon Szreter, 'The right of registration: Development, identity registration and social security – a historical perspective', *World Development* 2007:35, pp. 67–86.

28   'Who Counts' series, *The Lancet* (October 2007), especially Philip W. Setel & Simon Szreter et al., 'A scandal of invisibility – making everybody count by counting everyone', <http://www.who.int/healthinfo/statistics/LancetWhoCounts/en/>.

29   Commission on Social Determinants of Health, *Closing the Gap in a Generation. Health Equity through Action on the Social Determinants of Health* (Geneva: WHO, 2008), <http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2008/9789241563703_eng.pdf>.

30   *Social Protection for the Poorest in Africa: Learning from Experience*, International Conference held in Entebbe, Uganda, 8–10 September 2008 (organized by Development Research and Training, the Chronic Poverty Research Centre, and the Brooks World Poverty Institute).

31   Solar's article stimulated debate with Steve King: Steve King, 'Poor relief and English economic development reappraised', *Economic History Review* 1997:50, pp. 360–368; Peter M. Solar, 'Poor relief and English economic development: A renewed plea for comparative history', *Economic History Review* 1997:50, pp. 369–374; Steve King, *Poverty and Welfare in England 1700–1850. A Regional Perspective*, Manchester 2000. For a stimulating recent contribution, written with a contemporary policy audience in mind see Richard M. Smith, 'Social security as a developmental institution? Extending the solar case for the relative efficacy of poor relief provisions under the English Old Poor Law' (Brooks World Poverty Institute Working Paper, 56:2008).

32   Nandan Nilekani, *Imagining India*, London 2008, p. 350.

33   Evaluation interviews with a random sample of historians in the History & Policy Network, Dec. 2009 – Feb. 2010.

34   <http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page4220>, Blair 2003.

35   John W. Dower, 'Don't expect democracy this time: Iraq and Japan', <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-10.html>; B. Milton-Edwards, 'Iraq, past, present and future: A thoroughly-modern mandate?', <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-13.html>.

36   Onora O'Neill, cited in Innovation, Universities, Science and Skills Committee, *Uncorrected Transcript of Oral Evidence, Wednesday 25 February 2009, Q133*, 2009, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmdius/uc168-ii/uc16802.htm>.

37   <http://aph.org.au/>.