Unite, Proletarian Brothers!
Radicalism and Revolution in the Spanish Second Republic
MATTHEW KERRY
CONTENTS

2 Presidential Letter
5 Events Programme
6 Supporting the Next Generation of Historians
8 RHS Policy Work: Open Access
10 RHS Policy Work: GDPR for Historians
13 LGBT+ Survey Update
14 Race, Ethnicity & Equality Report Update
15 First New Historical Perspectives Titles
22 Aylmer Seminar Report
25 Newly Elected Members and Fellows

Cover image: Collection of upcoming New Historical Perspectives titles
This has been a hectic but highly productive year for the Royal Historical Society’s Council and staff, as readers of this newsletter will recognise. In the pages that follow, developments relating to publishing and equal opportunities are covered in particular detail, so I’ll address them only schematically here before drawing attention to a few other notable developments that may be of interest.

On the publishing front, this has been a year dominated in many ways by open access (OA) developments. For researchers who publish journal articles (and for journal editors and scholarly societies that sponsor journals) the debates unleashed in autumn 2018 with the announcement of the ‘Plan S’ initiative have been especially formative. The coalition of funders who support Plan S want all peer-reviewed research articles to be fully available to all readers OA—that is, online, without charge, immediately upon publication and permanently thereafter. This version of OA has major implications for History journals and societies that sponsor journals. The RHS’s survey of UK and international History journals this summer attracted 107 responses from editors, whose journals are either self-published or published by one of 26 university or commercial presses. As readers of the ensuing October 2019 RHS report (discussed below on pages 8-9) will see, History editors and their publishing partners are keen to ensure that funding bodies’ new OA mandates allow for greater circulation of research publications by historians without undercutting the structures (notably local, national and international History societies) that help enable the research activity that underpins publication. With respect to OA book publication, the RHS is now an established innovator, in collaboration with the Institute of Historical Research. It is a delight to see publication of the first OA title in our New Historical Perspectives series announced below. Attendees at our next public lecture (29 November 2019) who stay for the reception will be able to examine hard copies of Edward Owens’s *The Family Firm: Monarchy, Mass Media and the British Public, 1932-53*. Colleagues unable to attend this event can already download the book as a free PDF.

With three recent reports (the first published in 2015 and the next two in 2018) on the landscape of equal opportunities in UK History to our name, the Society is increasingly viewed as a source of carefully-researched, hard-headed and hard-hitting information and guidance on this topic. Articles in this newsletter detail our ongoing work, much assisted by the appointment in July of Dr Shahmima Akhtar as our Past & Present Fellow: Race, Ethnicity & Equality.
in History and by the LGBT+ working group led by our Vice President for Equalities, Professor Frances Andrews. References to the reports pop up in a surprising number of contexts. A representative of the database and research resources provider ProQuest with whom I spoke this week, noted that the Race, Ethnicity & Equality report was feeding into their discussions with libraries about what kinds of materials need to be digitised for students and researchers. Similarly, examination board representatives have used the report as a starting point for new discussions about GCSE and A-level content. The Society was delighted to learn that Dr Jonathan Saha of the University of Leeds had been short-listed for the ‘Made us think’ category of this year’s Wonkhe Awards, for his blog on this report, of which he is a co-author.

Highpoints of any annual list of RHS activities include our (normally twice-yearly) visits to selected UK History departments. At the Open University in May, staff organised a first-rate symposium on ‘Reflections on the Centenary of the First World War’, with a keynote lecture by Professor Jay Winter of Yale University and an impressive roster of other speakers from UK heritage organisations and universities. The event was livestreamed, allowing interested historians and the broader public to attend virtually and participate by emailing questions for the speakers. The visit also afforded an opportunity for Council members to meet for several hours with Open University staff and postgraduate students in History. Both the commitment of OU History staff to student welfare and their imaginative thinking about who can be a student of History were palpably evident. Dr Rosalind Crone’s work with students in secure environments (such as prisons) exemplified lateral thinking at its best. More broadly, the skills and knowledge that OU History staff have acquired teaching a population in which a quarter of students have a registered disability will prove very useful to the RHS when we turn attention to disability issues that have an impact on teaching, learning and research in our discipline.

September saw the RHS on the road again, to attend a 2-day symposium, book launch and departmental meeting at Nottingham Trent University. Focused on ‘Charity, Welfare and Emotions in Early Modern Britain and Ireland’, the symposium was free to attend, attracting both postgraduate students and established researchers from Scotland, England and the US. The evening saw us
travel to nearby Wollaton Hall, for a lecture by Professor Jo Ann Moran Cruz (Georgetown University) on ‘The Elizabethan Willoughbys of Wollaton Hall: Through the eyes of Cassandra Willoughby, Duchess of Chandos (1670–1735)’. Drawing from an edited edition published earlier this year in our Camden series, this well-attended public lecture recounted a compelling family history by focusing on the lives of its disorderly women. On the following day, the RHS returned to Nottingham Trent, where Head of History, Professor Andrew Gritt and his colleagues gave us a detailed and comprehensive overview of recruitment, teaching, learning and research in their department. As at the Open University, the considered thought and imagination that staff at Nottingham Trent are giving to the opportunities and challenges of university History were inspiring.

A new and salutary development this year, prompted and organised by Professor Abigail Woods of KCL, was our first RHS meeting with Heads of History, held at KCL in May. With over 20 attendees, this event provided an opportunity for academic staff, transmogrified willingly or unwillingly into academic managers, to compare notes, brainstorm and share best practice with colleagues. This is definitely an event the RHS plans to repeat, with a second meeting due to take place in 2020, and a plan to ensure that these meetings are held in different regions each year to maximise HoDs’ opportunities to attend. More details on the first HoDs meeting are available from the RHS blog: https://blog.royalhistsoc.org/2019/10/10/heads-together-hods-meeting/. Members and Fellows who visit the blog will see that its content now covers a wide range of historical topics and policy areas. Proposals for new blogs are always welcome: https://blog.royalhistsoc.org/contact/.

Just one final note before you plunge into the newsletter. We have in the past produced two hard copy newsletters each year, in May and November. From 2020 onward, our plan is to provide hard copies of the May newsletter only to the small number of Fellows and Members who do not use email—instead, the May newsletter will be circulated to most members electronically. This change reflects both a goal of preserving the environment and being mindful of our need to steward the Society’s financial resources—not least to provide grants and publishing opportunities for early career historians. The November newsletter will be expanded in scope and will continue to be sent as a hard copy to all Members and Fellows whose subscriptions are up to date. We’ve already added a new feature to this newsletter—a comprehensive list of all new Fellows and Members elected during the past year. If you know of any historians who might be interested in joining the Society, please do direct them to the website (https://royalhistsoc.org/membership/). Applications are assessed four times a year, and we’re always happy to assist if prospective applicants have questions about the process.

Professor Margot Finn, President

To contact the President:
president@royalhistsoc.org
Friday 7 February 2020 at 6.00 pm  
*RHS Lecture*: Dr Andrew Arsan  
Gustave Tuck Lecture Theatre, UCL

Friday 11 March 2020  
*The Gerald Aylmer Seminar*  
in conjunction with the IHR and TNA  
The National Archives

2 April 2020  
*RHS Visit*: Edge Hill University

Friday 1 May 2020 at 6.00 pm  
*RHS Lecture*: Professor Sarah Hamilton  
Gustave Tuck Lecture Theatre, UCL

13 - 15 May 2020  
*RHS Symposium*: University of Warwick  
‘The Multicultural City in Historical Perspective’

Friday 3 July 2020 at 6.00 pm  
*The RHS Prothéro Lecture*: Professor Linda Colley  
*and Publication, Fellowship and Teaching Awards*  
Gustave Tuck Lecture Theatre, UCL

Friday 18 September 2020 at 6.00 pm  
*RHS Lecture*: Dr Simon Ditchfield  
UCL

October 2019  
*The Colin Matthew Memorial Lecture for the Public Understanding of History*: Professor John Arnold  
in co-operation with Gresham College, London

Friday 27 November 2020 at 6.00 pm  
*Presidential Address*  
Professor Margot Finn: ‘Material Turns in British History: Part IV’  
UCL
SUPPORTING THE NEXT GENERATION OF HISTORIANS

Imogen Evans joined the RHS as Administrative Secretary in May. Here she outlines some of the work being done to support historians.

As part of the Society’s commitment to promote the vitality of historical scholarship and to encourage early career historians, the RHS awards a number of research grants annually. These small grants, of up to £750 each, make important contributions to postgraduate research, support conference presentations and attendance by postgraduates and early career scholars, and help finance events where there is substantial involvement of early career (postgraduate and immediate postdoctoral) researchers.

Grant applications are assessed by the Research Support Committee, which is comprised of professional historians who sit on the RHS Council. Successful applicants then liaise with the Society’s Administrative Secretary to submit required proofs of expenditures and provide reports of how they used the funding. The Research Support Committee has an annual budget of £62,500 to back these grants, which includes a generous supplement from the Past & Present Society. This supplement allows the RHS to also fund doctoral students who are studying outside of the United Kingdom.

Between July 2018 and June 2019, the Society funded a total of 198 grants, which included funding for research expenses, conference travel and conference organisation. In this year, the Society received a total of 299 applications, which - in range as well as quality - gave a heartening impression of the health of History as a discipline.

The Society awarded 95 doctoral students grants for Research Expenses between July 2018 and June 2019. This funding can contribute to visiting archives, exploring historical sites or conducting oral history interviews, and the Society considers applications for both international and UK-based research. Calum Aikman, doctoral candidate at the University of Edinburgh, was one of 26 recipients of a UK Research Expenses grant. With our grant, Aikman was able to visit both the Weston Library in Oxford to access the collections of several Labour politicians and the Modern Records Centre at the University of Warwick to examine docu-
ments relating to trade union history and industrial relations in the 1960s and 1970s. In his research report, he wrote that this research was ‘vital’ to his thesis, which explores divisions among the social-democratic right wing of the British Labour Party in the 1970s.

Nathaniel Andrews, doctoral candidate at the University of Leeds, received one of 69 non-UK Research Expenses grants, which he used towards a two-week intensive research trip to Barcelona and Alcoy for his thesis, which includes a case-study of Spanish anarchism at the turn of the twentieth century. Andrews wrote, ‘This research trip was essential to the completion of my doctoral studies, as I now have enough material to compose the second two chapters of my thesis’.

The RHS acknowledges that not all early career researchers have equal access to institutional funding to attend conferences, and thus offers a Conference Travel grant. This grant option funded 61 trips to academic conferences last year.

The Society financially supported Esther Brot’s attendance at the International Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Conference. Brot is a doctoral student at King’s College London, who noted that presenting at the conference ‘served an important purpose in my postgraduate career for professional development and for testing out new concepts for my dissertation’. The Society believes that conference presentations and attendance are vital opportunities for a young scholar’s intellectual development and for their relationships with specialists in their fields.

During this financial year, the Society funded 30 academic conferences, through Conference Organisation grants, which are designed to subsidise conference registration fees to increase the involvement of early career researchers. In May 2019, Purba Hossain and Emily Webb were awarded a Conference Organisation grant for Across Colonial Lines: Empires, Commodities and Movements, a specialist conference held at the University of Leeds on 18 September 2019. Over three panels, this conference explored how commodities circulated within and between Empire(s) and how commodities were produced, exchanged and consumed in colonial settings. Panellists presented a wide range of research, which included discussions of indigo across British colonial territories and the gendering of spaces in tea shops as well as the methodological challenges of commodity history. In their conference report, Hossain and Webb thanked the Society for its financial support, which ‘enabled a broad range of scholars to attend and engage in the conference’. They wrote, ‘We have received several very positive comments on the conference, especially on the diversity of papers, the good mix of people from different stages of academic career, and the involved discussion throughout the day’.

For more information on Research Support Grants in 2020, please visit https://royalhistsoc.org/grants/. The next application deadlines for research support in 2020 are 13th January, 30th March, 8th June, and 26th October.
The RHS is actively engaged in ongoing debates about the future of publishing in the Humanities, including Open Access (OA). As a discipline, History has embraced the possibilities of diverse models for sharing the results of our research and historians have been alive to the ethical questions these models raise. We welcome an open access landscape that: offers flexibility and enables innovation; is equitable and accessible in the widest sense; strengthens and promotes sustainable scholarly cultures, societies and research ecosystems; and brings academics, publishers and scholarly communication specialists into productive dialogue.

As part of this commitment, we have developed our New Historical Perspectives book series, the first volume of which (Ed Owens’ *Family Firm*) has just been published. We have been working constructively to respond to wider developments in open access, including contributing to the Universities UK OA Monographs Group, which published its report on 8 October.

Over the past year, much of the Society’s attention within open access policy has focused on the implications of Plan S. Launched in September 2018, this is a radical open access publishing initiative formulated by cOAlition S, a confederation of predominantly European national funding bodies. Co-ordinated by Science Europe, and supported by the European Commission, cOAlition S’s core group includes two UK-based bodies: UK Research & Innovation (UKRI, which includes the 7 UK Research Councils and Research England, the body that orchestrates the UK Research Excellence Framework exercise), and the Wellcome Trust, a registered charity granting over £900m annually in research funds.

Plan S aims to accelerate the transition toward full and immediate open access publication of all peer-reviewed journal articles based on original research. It has major implications for academic journals, and for the UK and international researchers who publish in these outlets. The RHS, like many other learned societies is concerned about the potential effects of Plan S on equality and diversity within the discipline, independent and self-funded research, early career researchers, the economic viability of learned societies and research ecosystems more widely. Crucially it is...
currently unknown whether UKRI will apply Plan S requirements to all scholarly articles funded by “Quality-Related” (QR) income derived from the REF, and/or if it will require all outputs submitted to future REF exercises (that is, after REF2021) to meet Plan S open access specifications.

Over the summer we surveyed the editors of c.150 History journals, based in the UK and internationally, to find out the extent to which History journals are ready for the implementation of imminent open access mandates such as Plan S, and the implications for historians if all research supported by cOAlition S funders is to be published open access. Our current priority is to provide discipline-specific evidence, analysis and information to enable historians to contribute to two successive Open Access Reviews that UKRI plans to undertake in autumn 2019 and winter 2020.

Our latest report, which is based in part on the 107 responses to our survey, is available from the Policy pages of the RHS website (https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/). It concludes that while many journal editors and publishers are aware of open access policies, most UKRI- and Wellcome-funded researchers within the discipline of History are not currently in a position to comply with the technical requirements that cOAlition S has set out for online journals, platforms or repositories. The survey responses document significant variations in History editors’ awareness of both Plan S and UK Open Access policies. They suggest that few journals have finalised decision-making or planning to meet the full compliance criteria mandated by Plan S. Many journals clearly state no intention to change policies.

A number of factors seem to have promoted a ‘wait and see’ approach to Plan S. These include the currently unknown nature of UKRI’s intended ‘alignment’ with Plan S; concerns about journals’ ability to fund the costs of high quality peer-review and editing outside the subscription model; the known inequalities that mark authors’ access to both funding for research and access to open access repositories; and issues of scale and medium- to long-term sustainability.

A great diversity of History journals serves this variegated international research community. Understanding the structures, norms and needs of research journals in different disciplines and geographical locations is vital for all stakeholders if any sustained and equitable transition towards fully open access publication is going to succeed. We urge historians who edit or publish in peer-reviewed journals to read and give feedback on the Society’s open access policy papers.

For more information, read the recently published Universities UK Open Access Monograph report. It can be accessed online at the following link: http://bit.ly/UUKOAreport
RHS POLICY WORK:
GDPR

Research and Communications Officer Katherine Foxhall reports on Developing Guidelines for Historians to work with GDPR

The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) came into effect on 25 May 2018, replacing previous legislation dating from 1995. But how does it affect the work of historians? At the Royal Historical Society we are currently working on a set of guidelines for historians that will help explain the GDPR and its terminology in more detail, outline historians’ responsibilities under data protection legislation and explain the exemptions that attach to historical research.

What is the GDPR and why do historians need to know about it?

The GDPR governs how individuals, companies and organisations operating in the EU can process personal data relating to individuals (“data subjects”), and the rights of those individuals in relation to the data held about them. In the UK it is enacted through the Data Protection Act 2018.

The new regulations were designed to protect online privacy rights in a digital economy, and they apply to any business, individual, charity, museum, library, research group or project that collects information about a living individual. This includes historical researchers.

The requirements of the GDPR are most clearly relevant to historians who use oral histories, twentieth-century and contemporary material. But it may also apply if using data about a deceased person could...
potentially identify, or make identifiable, a living individual in a way that might cause “substantial damage and distress”. Examples might include information in asylum or medical records, criminal trials, or politically sensitive material relating to topics such as the Irish Troubles, civil rights movements, political insurgencies or anti-colonial struggles.

Additionally, data protection laws apply if you collect any form of personal data from participants (e.g. names and/or contact details) while working with volunteers, or carrying out impact or public engagement activities.

The good news is that GDPR and the UK Data Protection Act take a positive approach to archiving and using material for historical research and academic purposes by:

- obliging public authorities and private or public bodies to “acquire, preserve, appraise, arrange, describe, communicate, promote, disseminate and provide access to” records that have “enduring value for general public interest” and that could provide information related to “political behaviour under former totalitarian state regimes, genocide, crimes against humanity, in particular the Holocaust, or war crimes.”
- extending the already significant “special purposes” exemptions for journalism, art and literature to also include academic research and publishing.

**Basic Principles of the GDPR in UK law**

The GDPR is based on a set of principles that govern the use of personal data. These are: lawfulness, fairness and transparency; purpose limitation; data minimisation; accuracy; storage limitation; security and accountability. In addition, data protection law requires the identification of one lawful basis for data processing from these options: consent; to perform a contract; to comply with a legal obligation; to protect the vital interests of the data subject or another person; in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority; for the purposes of legitimate interests.
Exemptions for “academic purposes” and “historical research”

These principles and legal bases give stronger rights for data subjects which on the face of it appear highly restrictive and complicated. However, these requirements are balanced by individual rights to freedom of expression and information. Accordingly, there are important exemptions for data processing which is undertaken for journalism, art, literature and academic purposes. These “special purposes” are exempt from all of the principles except data security and accountability, and from the requirement to identify a lawful basis. Most academic historians will find that much of their use of personal data for research can be covered by these exemptions.

If your use of personal data does not meet the definitions of researching or publishing for journalistic, academic, artistic or literary purposes, a more limited set of exemptions from the GDPR’s provisions on data subject’s individual rights applies to data processing for “scientific or historical research purposes” or “statistical purposes”.

Researchers must be able to justify their use of an exemption, ensure the security of data, and only process data necessarily. But, while the GDPR has implications for how historians access, process, use and publish information about (or that might identify) living individuals, it does not represent a seismic shift in how data can be used in research. Key considerations for researchers in using personal data remain ethical and practical in order to avoid any likelihood of “substantial damage or substantial distress”.

The RHS report on GDPR for historians is due out in the New Year, very much enhanced by the generous assistance and guidance of experts at the TNA, British Library and Dr Jay Fedorak (Jersey Information Commissioner and RHS Fellow).

Katherine Foxhall is the RHS Research and Communications Officer. Please send any corrections or comments on this piece to: rescommsofficer@royalhistsoc.org.

If you would like to write for the Historical Transactions blog, please contact the Historical Transactions editor, Katherine Foxhall by email: k.foxhall@royalhistsoc.org.
As keen followers of our activities will know, the Royal Historical Society LGBT+ online questionnaire closed at the end of September. Following the two Gender (2015 and 2018) and the Race, Ethnicity and Equality (2018) reports, this is the third survey the RHS has undertaken in the past couple of years, and it attracted an unprecedented 852 respondents.

It will take the working group some time to digest the over 5400 written comments, with many thoughtful and nuanced responses to the necessarily simplified questions imposed by the survey format. But we can already report that, alongside academic historians, many historians working as archivists, librarians, curators or in the media or the heritage sector participated. 225 undergraduate historians also responded, which may explain why 30 per cent of respondents identified themselves as 24 years old or under, although we hope that our respondents will include mature students, and not all respondent indicated their age.

The spread of replies from historians working in academic posts is also well-balanced, with no extremely small or extremely large groups (except emeriti, of whom few replied). And as we expected, large numbers of respondents combine multiple roles. 73 respondents identified their nationality as from the EU, and 106 from the rest of the world. Almost 17 per cent of respondents identified themselves as having an “impairment, health condition or learning difference”. So the working group’s report should reflect LGBT+ histories as they are practised and experienced across a whole range of different career stages, choices and perspectives.

The data needs much more careful analysis but as we get started, we’d like to begin with grateful thanks to those of you who took the trouble to give us your views.

Professor Frances Andrews
RHS Vice President
University of St Andrews
I recently joined the Royal Historical Society as a Past and Present post-doctoral fellow working on the equality initiative detailed in the Race, Ethnicity & Equality in UK History: A Report and Resource for Change (2018). This was the product of a working group established in 2017, which is continuing to work systematically on these issues (Find out more here: https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/race/).

In the year since the report was published, it has fed into existing equalities work in the sector and helped spur new initiatives. There are clear signs of a growing commitment to racial and ethnic equality; within a few weeks of the report being issued, several History departments had held events to discuss it and more have since been organised. Whenever possible, a working group member has attended these events. This helps us to share what we have learned and continue to find out more about local strategies and practical efforts to address inequalities.

We have been impressed by the creativity of the responses sparked by the report. In an effort to amplify the work going on across Britain, we plan to produce a series of best practice handbooks on key issues such as recruitment of students from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) backgrounds and grappling effectively with BME attainment gaps. These will be workshopped in draft form, refined, and then issued as a series of open access PDFs for broader use. It really feels like a pivotal moment for the practice of History in the UK. We are keen to help enable conversations around race, ethnicity and equality in order to make our discipline a safe, welcoming and positive space in which to study and work for BME staff, students and allies alike.

Shahmima Akhtar  
Past & Present Fellow: Race, Ethnicity & Equality in History  
Royal Historical Society and the Institute for Historical Research
NEW HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

The first title in the Open Access New Historical Perspectives series is now available


Now Available!
In HB, PB & Open Access

The New Historical Perspectives series is Open Access, and all the books in the series will be available both as high-quality hard copy books and as PDFs available to download in full without charge. Work is published at no cost to authors. Formats include monographs, edited collections, and longer or shorter form works that can be single or multi-authored. Anyone who is within ten years of getting a doctorate from a university in the UK or Republic of Ireland is eligible to submit a proposal.
NEW HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Some of our first authors introduce their upcoming publications in our Open Access series

Our volume, *Individuals and Institutions in Medieval Scholasticism*, will appear in Spring 2020 in the Society’s ‘New Historical Perspectives’ series. It shows how different institutional contexts influenced given thinkers and groups, and also how their thinking shaped so-called ‘real world’ issues and practices.

Such an approach to making links across themes is important, because until now the history of individuals and institutions in scholasticism has been treated either as a simple intellectual genealogy of schools and doctrines, or a constitutional history of particular organizational forms. Individualization has been seen generally as a matter of dissent and heterodoxy in relation to orthodox teachings or ideas (dissenters, such as Peter Abelard, generally being more ‘individual’ than ‘orthodox’ thinkers). ‘Institutionalization’ itself has tended to comprise successive
exercises in the promulgation of organizational statutes risking static and sterile histories. Neither individuals and institutions, nor scholasticism have been especially well-served by such an approach.

In our volume, Pete Biller looks at how canon law and theology influenced inquisitorial practices in Toulouse; Sylvain Piron explores the disruptions within the Franciscan Order arising from new thinking about what a ‘rule’ or ‘vow’ actually was; while Isabel Iribarren considers how Jean Gerson’s poetry promoted new religious practices centred around the cult of the marriage of Joseph and Mary.

A wide-ranging and theoretically engaged introduction sets these themes in a detailed historiographical context, situating the volume’s contribution in relation to what we understand ‘scholasticism’ to have been; how we can usefully think about its ‘individuals’; and how we can constructively consider their intellectual groupings and configurations. A first set of essays explores the ways in which particular intellectual traditions were created. Contributions include Antonia Fitzpatrick on how Franciscan-Dominican conflict necessitated the switching of doctrinal ideas associated with one ‘side’ to the other; John Marenbon on the importance to the iconoclast Pietro Pomponazzi of his disciplinary Arts training; Matthew Kempshall’s argument that Nicholas Trevet’s approach to History was closely linked to sophisticated thinking about what the discipline was allowed to explain, and not per se ‘conservative’; and Blaise Dufal on the self-image of tradition and transmission within scholastic genealogies.

A second group of essays examines the relationship between individuals and organizational forms—with chapters by Piron and Biller, along with that of Gert Melville who argues for the paradox of charismatic individuals who make their own extraordinary ideas appear routine through religious orders. A final set of chapters explores how individuals generated particular social practices. Here John Sabapathy considers Robert of Courson’s distinctive way of thinking systematically about connected practical, pastoral problems; Emily Corran argues that ways of thinking about scandal in the thirteenth century were themselves a social institution; and Cornelia Linde shows how Dominicans created a distinctive understanding of the practice of confession.

As this brief chapter summary makes clear, our volume is open-minded about what can constitute a ‘scholastic’ source, as well as inclusive in bringing together historians whose approaches have been shaped by very different European historiographies, which can sometimes be hard for English-speaking readers to access. David d’Avray rounds matters off by stepping back to take stock of the volume and the prospectus it offers scholars.
These issues are currently undergoing something of a resurgence to which the volume contributes and hopes to help shape. It was, for instance, very striking how many of our themes chimed with questions raised at a recent international conference on the reception and publication of scholastic texts between 1150 and 1230, organized by Nicholas Vincent for the British Academy, in Cambridge in September 2019. To take just one example, Vincent’s own paper demonstrated the existence of an English ‘Nation’ of scholars in Paris well before references to this organized grouping in the 1220s. Arguably it produced every single thirteenth-century archbishop of Canterbury, though has never been studied as such. Plainly there is much work yet to be done. Scholasticism itself was a pan-European phenomenon, benefitting from the confluence of scholars across the continent. In a small way, *Individuals and Institutions* seeks to exemplify that and to point some ways forward for future work which we hope, despite the times, can be as genuinely European as scholasticism was.

---

Antonia Fitzpatrick is a trainee barrister, Student Director for the School Exclusion Project, City University, and a former lecturer at St John’s College, Oxford.

John Sabapathy is Senior Lecturer in Medieval History at University College London.
Civilian Specialists at War: Britain's Transport Experts and the First World War will be published in Spring 2020 as part of the RHS’s New Historical Perspectives series. The war of 1914–1918 was the first great general conflict to be fought between highly industrialised societies, each able to manufacture and transport immense quantities of people and goods over land and sea. This capability was fundamental to the prosecution of the war as it allowed for the creation and sustenance of colossal forces far removed from their home bases. British forces participated in operations in Western and Southern Europe, the Middle East, throughout Africa, and as far as China.

The deployment of such large forces, in many cases in inhospitable conditions, required a transport infrastructure that could be responsible for the conveyance of almost everything that the armies required in order to fight and survive during the conflict. The extant road, rail, and waterborne systems were essential for the feeding of the troops, for the maintenance of their equipment, and to the evolution of the material-intensive combat methodologies that have come to dominate the popular imagery of the First World War.

In my forthcoming book, Civilian Specialists at War, I examine the contribution of Britain’s transport experts to the emergence of these supply delivery systems that were capable of meeting the requirements of Britain’s largest ever military commitment. In doing so, I demonstrate the manner in which the latent experience and knowledge of Britain’s civilian specialists came to play a critical role in shaping the character of the warfare that developed between 1914 and 1918.
My book offers a deeper consideration of the implications that underpin the well-known description of the First World War as ‘an industrial war’. It provides an explanation as to how Britain’s transport experts helped to sustain the largest army the British Empire had ever created, both across a multitude of environments and through the employment of innovative methods drawn from some of pre-war British industry’s largest private enterprises. It examines the role played by primarily non-military participants in the creation, coordination, and effective management of an immense global distribution network; one that was responsible for allowing an unprecedented form of intense warfare to persist, and which was the product of contributions made on both sides of an increasingly porous civil-military divide. My central argument challenges the idea that Britain’s military leaders, memorably labelled ‘the donkeys’ in Alan Clark’s influential text of the same name, were reluctant to engage with expertise accumulated beyond the confines of the armed forces. Instead, I show that the British army possessed an awareness of the implications of industrial war in terms of the need to deploy men of specialist knowledge and ability in suitable positions.

However, the application of civilian expertise was hampered by a combination of external and internal factors. Throughout the war Britain fought as part of a coalition, whose members’ influence waxed and waned as the conflict progressed. In the war’s principal theatre, Britain’s major ally retained a desire to control the extent of British influence over the shared transport infrastructure upon which the success of the allied war effort depended. Alongside charting these developments, my book emphasizes the evolving nature of the British army and state’s understanding of the commitments—in human, material, and financial terms—that were required to establish the processes and procedures necessary to wage a successful war of attrition against the Central Powers. The multiple contributions made by Britain’s transport experts are a fundamental component of understanding how the British army and state conceived their roles in a global, industrial conflict at the start of the twentieth century.

The individual experiences charted in my book illustrate the impact that members of a highly skilled, modern workforce were able to have over the conduct of the fighting that took place between 1914 and 1918. Furthermore, in the context of preparations for Britain’s exit from the EU on both sides of the English Channel, these insights underscore the value of specialist knowledge and the importance of maintaining reliability in the supply chains upon which much of Britain’s continued economic stability relies.

*Dr Christopher Phillips teaches in the Department of International Politics at Aberystwyth University.*
Our expectations for technology invariably exceed what comes to pass. Within the fields of historical research and engagement, few recent developments have brought more opportunity, and disruption, than the rise of digital: providing new ways to discover, quantify, catalogue, communicate and visualize the past. But digital’s impact also remains partial and open to scrutiny. Digital practices continue to co-exist with alternative, well-established and often more effective forms of historical engagement. The ‘digital age’ is therefore one of hybridity; one in which historians, archivists and heritage professionals work in a complex, and more interesting, mixed economy of digital and analogue.

In taking digital as its theme, the 2019 Aylmer Seminar—held in February at the National Archives—focused specifically on this hybrid state. Notwithstanding recent change, it’s clear we’re not making a swift linear progression from analogue to digital. Rather we will be living in a world of hybrid archives and research practices for the foreseeable future. This raises important and interesting questions that the 2019 Seminar sought to address by looking—as in previous years—at historians’ and archivists’ shared interest and collaboration in archival creation, presentation and interpretation.

In part hybridity is a physical state: how do we best maintain, access or integrate analogue and digital forms of content? But, importantly, it’s also about how we work with, and think about, the many formats that exist with the broad categories of ‘analogue’ and ‘digital’. We often assume we’re prepared for working digitally thanks to an earlier training in analogue research methods. Yet our own hybridity may mean we’re less equipped than we might suppose. Historians’ readiness for modern research environments emerged as a key theme of this year’s seminar.

The theme of hybridity was addressed with reference to three central practices: archival preservation, historical research in the archive, and engagement both for archival creation and dissemination. In addition, speakers considered their understanding of and the challenges posed by digital hybridity over time. This focus on chronological change within the digital revolution was central to an opening keynote discussion on the ‘Past, present and future of digital preservation’. This saw contributions from Alice Prochaska who looked back to her early digital work at the British Library, Jane Winters who
reflected on the nature and extent of current challenges, and John Sheridan of TNA who set out those awaiting researchers in the near future.

Access to contemporary history, stored digitally, was the focus of the ‘Preservation’ panel. In ‘Embracing the hybrid archive: some reflections’, Jenny Mitchell of the Digital Preservation Trust considered how we best handle those points of transition—from analogue to digital content, and then to more advanced digital forms—in archival projects that chart the very recent past. James Newman (Bath Spa University) highlighted the threat of rapid digital deterioration in his account of the UK’s National Videogame Museum. Here, he and other curators have abandoned technical preservation to focus instead on recreating the experience of playing these increasingly inaccessible forms of video entertainment from the 1980s and 1990s.

For their presentations on ‘Research’ the historian Ruth Ahnert (QMUL) and Rachel Foss of the British Library offered case studies of hybridity, via their respective projects on Tudor spy networks and modern writers’ archives. Both speakers focused on projects that, while making use of technologies such as network visualization or video diaries, remain grounded in established scholarly practices that underpin the integrity of their research. As Ruth reminded us, a significant portion of any digital project is likely to be data-preparation based on solid historical sense and traditional skills.

In the final ‘Engagement’ panel Naomi Wells (School of Advanced Study, University of London) discussed her archiving of digital and off-line records that relate to recent generations of London’s Latin American community. Here the relative impersonality of digital content poses distinctive challenges, as researchers seek to engage community members in a work of public history. By contrast, The Tate Gallery’s Adrian Glew set out some of the opportunities inherent in digital archiving—not least the remote engagement of users in the work of cataloguing, transcription and interpretation.

From the outset, Seminar organizers had been aware that hybridity poses challenges with which we’re only now beginning to grapple. Contributors were asked to speak about their achievements, but also difficulties encountered with physical hardware, code-based software, or their own limitations of working in environments requiring a range of skills.

A closing session of short ‘Problems and provocations’ addressed these limitations head on. For the National Archives, Jo Pugh considered how much trust we should invest in digital records, and just how trusting we currently are; Kelly Foster from AfroCROWD UK addressed the lack of equity in archival projects relating to ethnic minority groups; and Jo Fox of the IHR returned to one of the day’s principal themes—outlining how ill-equipped many historians are for dealing with digital sources. Each was a call for greater awareness that we all do well to ponder.

Philip Carter is Head of Digital at the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, and a member of the Aylmer Seminar organizing panel.
The Bibliography of British and Irish History (BBIH) is a research and publishing project of the Royal Historical Society, the Institute of Historical Research and the academic publisher, Brepols.

It’s the most comprehensive and authoritative guide to what’s published on British and Irish history—covering Roman Britain to the present day, and histories of the British Isles, former empire and Commonwealth.

BBIH is regularly updated. Following the Autumn 2019 update, it offers:

- Records of 610,000 books, articles, chapters and edited collections
- 5200 records relating to works published in 2018-19
- Details of scholarly reviews for individual monographs, with links to online articles
- Search by content type: monographs, articles, book chapters, edited collections or theses
- Records of 1200 PhDs covering the history of London
- Content from a widening range of journals, now including the Journal of West African History, the Society of Malawi Journal and the Journal of South African History

BBIH’s January 2020 update adds new content, extra links to the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, and an improved results display. For more on BBIH, see: history.ac.uk/publications/bibliography-british-and-irish-history
# NEWLY ELECTED MEMBERS AND FELLOWS

## ELECTED JULY 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Michael Auslin</td>
<td>Major Patrick Crocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Stuart Aveyard</td>
<td>Dr Olivia Dee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jonathan Black</td>
<td>Dr Georgios Giannakopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Charles Bow</td>
<td>Mr Patrick Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Caroline Bressey</td>
<td>Dr Laura Moretti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Melissa Calaresu</td>
<td>Ms Michelle O’Mahony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christy Contantakopoulou</td>
<td>Dr Joan Redmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Tom Crook</td>
<td>Mr John Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Alistair Fair</td>
<td>Dr Martin Ruehl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Leigh Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Gary Gibbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Edward Gillin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Emma Hanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Trevor Harvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Gordon Heath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jenni Hyde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Tadeusz Kluczyński</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Julia Laite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jordan Landes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Andrew Lyall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ian Maddock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Briony McDonagh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sarah Mortimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Thomas Otte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sara Pennell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Lucy Sandler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christian Steer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Martha Vandrei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Walliss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postgraduate Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Panarat Anamwathana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Christopher Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Michael Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr James Brocklesby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Todd Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laura Channing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hao Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Polly Corrigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Thomas Goodwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robyn Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Raphael Heim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jonathan Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kesewa John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Rachel Kowalski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Chandan Mahal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laura Mainwaring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Christopher Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Themba Mtwazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Maanik Nath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Michael Nelles
Mr Luís Nicolau Marques da Silva
Mr Felix Oberholzer
Ms Saara Penttinen
Mr James Perry
Mr Calum Platts
Ms Bethany Rebisz
Mr Benjamin Schneider

ELECTED NOVEMBER 2018

Fellowship

Dr Richard Allen
Dr Jennifer Altehenger
Professor Sarah Ansari
Dr Judi Atkins
Dr Nicholas Barnett
Dr Christina Bashford
Dr Mike Bechthold
Dr Justin Bengry
Mr Clive James Bond
Dr Katharine Burn
Dr William Butler
Dr William Campbell
Dr Brian Casey
Dr Nandini Chatterjee
Dr Themis Chronopoulous
Dr Nicola Clark
Dr Lisa Colton
Professor Michael Cullinane
Dr Rohan Deb Roy
Dr Lucy Denton
Dr Aimee Fox
Dr Eric Golson
Dr James Goodchild
Dr Christine Grandy
Dr Vanessa Heggie
Dr Ian Howie-Willis
Dr Paul Jackson
Dr Miranda Kaufmann
Brigadier Benedict Kite
Dr Paul Kosmetatos
Dr Jordan Landes
Dr Joanna Laynesmith
Professor Sarah Lloyd
Dr Jan Loop

Dr Stewart McCain
Dr Leanne McCormick
Dr Christopher Miller
Dr Hugh Morrison
Dr Christian Mueller
Dr Andrew Mumford
Dr Gavin Murray-Miller
Professor Glen O’Hara
Dr Viviane Quirke
Professor Catherine Richardson
Deborah Ryan
Dr Laura Sangha
Professor Betty Schellenberg
Professor Bill Sherman
Dr Mark Smith
Dr Ian Speller
Dr Judith Spicksley
Dr Paul Watt
Dr Alexander Woolf

Membership

Dr Jacqueline Bemmer
Mr Ranit Kumar Bhuyan
Dr Shawn Bullock
Mr Chih-En Chen
Dr Stephanie Christelow
Dr Alison Creber
Mr Ian Dawon
Mr Robert Dempsey
Professor Matthew Eddy
Dr Andrew Flinn
Mr Oliver Hadingham
Mr Benjamin Hodges
Dr Charles Albert Munoz Jones
Dr Su Lin Lewis
Mr Keith Milne
Dr Chris Moores
Dr Joanne Norcup
Mr Frederick O’Dell
Mr Raphael Oidtmann
Mr David Olusaoga
Mr Christopher Perry
Dr Carolyn Sanzenbacher
Mr Robert Tuxford
Dr Harriett Webster
Postgraduate Membership

Mr Keith Alcorn
Ms Katherine Ambler
Mr Dominic Barker
Ms Ashleigh Black
Ms Krysten Blackstone
Ms Amie Bolissian McCrae
Mr Ross Brooks
Ms Hilary Burgardt
Mr Martin Carlino
Mr Bert Carlstrom
Mr Giles Connolly
Ms Megan Doole
Ms Elena Egawhary
Ms Sian Evans
Ms Jayne Friend
Mr Jason Frost
Mr Owain Gardner
Ms Roslyn Gardner
Mr Matthew Gerth
Mr Ryan Hale
Mr Bryant Harden
Mr John Harding
Mr Jack Hodgson
Mr Daniel Hunt
Ms Sadie Jarrett
Mr Robert Johnston
Mr James Kawalek
Ms Aleksandra Kaye
Mr James Lloyd
Mr Andrew Lunt
Ms Jennifer McHugh
Mr Liam McLeod
Ms Bethany McNamara-Dale
Mr Saarang Narayan
Ms Patricia Osborne
Ms Grace Owen
Mr Rhys Phillips
Mr Huw Rowlands
Ms Sukanya Raisharma
Mr Christopher Rouse
Mr Kevin Tuffnell
Ms Jessica Venner
Mr Tom Wilkinson
Mr Fu Yidong
Ms Victoria Yuskaitis

ELECTED FEBRUARY 2019

Fellowship

Dr Harriet Atkinson
Dr Michael Bender
Professor John Bew
Dr Claire Brock
Revd Dr Paul Chandler
Dr Donal Coffey
Dr Emily Corran
Professor Lilia Costabile
Dr James Crossland
Dr Mark Fenemore
Dr Jacob Field
Dr Michael Finch
Dr Marvin Fried
Dr Anselm Heinrich
Professor Ashley Jackson
Dr James Kirby
Dr Su Lin Lewis
Dr Shiraz Maher
Dr Donald McLean
Dr Christopher Millington
Professor Thomas Mole
Dr Rosamund Oates
Dr Justin Olmstead
Dr Estelle Paranque
Dr Mark Pendleton
Professor Raluca Radulescu
Dr Eleonara Rava
Professor Eleanor Robson
Professor Michael Scott
Dr Richard Scully
Dr Christopher Smith
Dr Florence Sutcliffe-Braithwaite
Professor Gregory Taylor
Dr Gregor Thuswaldner
Ms Jane Tolerton
Dr Mark Wallace

Membership

Mr Chris Baker
Dr Gary Buck
Dr John Burke
Ms Diana Burstein
Ms Gillian Crea
Dr Philip James Gooderson
Professor Katherine Harloe
Mr Antony Harvey
Dr Erin Jesse
Dr Łukasz Korporowicz
Mr John Latham-Sprinkle
Dr Phil Lyon
Dr Steph Palaidni
Mr Matthew Parker
Dr Timothy Peacock
Mr Harry Raffal
Dr Richard Reid
Dr Jack Skelton-Wallace
Dr Shelley Gail Tickell
Mr Taras Young
Dr Natalia Zajac

Postgraduate Membership

Ms Molly Avery
Baulia Barbosa Ribeiro
Mr John Beales
Ms Jessica Becker
Mr Lloyd Belton
Mr Joshua Bilton
Mr Robert Bullock
Mr Anotida Chikumbu
Mr Alexander Collin
Mr John Cooney
Mr Edward Dempster
Ms Munazza Ebtikar
Mr Mattias Eken
Mr Duncan Gager
Luis Galan-Guerrero
Ms Sage Goodwin
Mr Conor Heffernan
Ms Annalise Higgins
Mr Alan Jackson
Mr Mariusz Kaczka
Ms Natasia Kalajdziovski
Mr Simon Kirkpatrick
Mr Flamur Krasniqi
Mr Andrea Mancini
Mr Nenad Markovic
Ms Hannah Martin
Ms Samantha Middleton

Ms Elizabeth Miller
The Rev. Tanner Moore
Ms Katherine Murray
Ms Ryna Ordynat
Ms Sada Payir
Ms Sukanya Raisharma
Mr Hallam Roffey
Ms Eleanor Russell
Ms Zoe Screti
Mr Andrew Searle
Ms Anne Stokes
Mr John Sutcliffe IV
Mr David Tallon
Mr David Toman
Ms Elisabeth Trischler
Mr Steven Turner
Mr Panagiotis Tzovaras
Ms Mrinalini Venkateswaran
Ms Yasmin Vetter
Mr Lewis Wade
Mr Scott Wakeham
Mr Owen Walsh
Ms Karina Wendling
Ms Aryni Widiyawati

ELECTED MAY 2019

Fellowship

Dr Kristine Alexander
Dr Paul Ayris
Dr Marco Barducci
Dr Joshua Bennett
Dr Zoltan Biedermann
Dr Gilly Carr
Professor Megan Cassidy-Welch
Dr Hannah Cornwell
Professor Pamela Cox
Dr Katherine Cross
Dr Tom Cutterham
Professor Giuseppe De Luca
Dr Bruno De Nicola
Professor Donald Dickson
Dr Catherine Flinn
Professor Stella Ghervas
Dr Helen Glew
Dr Tim Grady
Professor Jane Hamlett
Dr Christopher Hill
Dr Andrew Hobbs
Dr Mike Horswell
Dr Robert Johnson
Dr Emily Jones
Professor Marjo Kaartinen
Professor Barbara Keys
Dr Samia Khatun
Professor Chi Kong Lai
Dr Katell Lavéant
Dr Daryl Leeworthy
Dr Marcella Lorenzini
Dr Andrew Macdonald
Dr Kirsteen Mackenzie
Dr Susan Major
Dr George K W Mak
Dr Erik Mathisen
Dr Alexander McAuley
Dr Christopher McCreery
Dr Joseph Moretz
Dr Rachel Moss
Dr John Newman
Ms Joanna Norman
Dr Onyeka Nubia
Dr Daphna Oren-Magidor
Mr Matthew Parker
Professor Sarah Pedersen
Professor Sarah Beverley
Ms Kavita Puri
Dr Sara Read
Dr Matthias Reiss
Dr Anna Ross
Dr Tobias Rupprecht
Professor Raffaella Santi
Dr Otto Saumarez-Smith
Dr Elizabeth Savage
Dr Udit Sen
Dr Caroline Sharples
Professor Jane Shaw
Mr Malcolm Shifrin
Dr Gajendra Singh
Dr Jonathan Smyth
Dr Malcolm Spencer
Dr Charles Tieszen
Dr Dora Vargha
Dr Geraldine Vaughan

Dr Jan Vermeiren
Dr Matthew Walker
Dr Neil Younger
Professor David Zersen

Membership

Dr Ann-Marie Akehurst
Dr Darinee Alagirisamy
Dr Rosamaria Alibrandi
Dr Gordon Barrett
Mr Nicholas Barrett
Ms Natalie Butler
Dr Chun Kei Blake
Dr Sajed Chowdury
Ms Juliana Coulton
Mr Michael Davies
Captain Steven Dieter
Dr Misha Ewen
Dr Boris Gorshkov
Ms Amanda Harvey
Dr Stephanie Howard-Smith
Mr Omer Khan
Dr Christopher Fear
Dr David Lees
Ms Judith Loades
Ms Mihaela Martin
Mrs Emma McCauley-Tinniswood
Ms Barbara Mellor
Ms Erin Moody
Dr Eric Morier-Genoud
Dr Hannah-Rose Murray
Dr Carole O’Reilly
Dr Hannah Parker
Professor Peter Pincemin-Johnstone
Dr Meredith Riedel
Dr Ilaria Scaglia
Dr Alexander Scott
Dr Gregory Scaglia
Ms Chrissie Slysz
Dr Joseph Twigg
Mrs Marilla Walker
Dr James Wearn
Dr Katherine Wilson
Dr Andrew Winrow
RHS Council Members and staff with some of our newly elected Fellows and Members following the September lecture

Postgraduate Membership

Mr Handy Acosta-Cuellar
Ms Maria Bastião
Ms Lacey Bonar
Ms Sarah Boote-Powell
Mr Gregory Buchanan
Ms Patcharaviral Charoenpacharaporn
Ms Jennifer Chochinov
Mr John Cooney
Ms Sonia Cuesta-Maniar
Mr Stephen Dickens
Ms Koma Donworth
Ms Olivia Durand
Mr Jack Edmunds
Ms Tzilla Eshel
Mr James Fortuna
Mr John Freeman
Mr Christophe Gillian
Ms Beth Griffiths
Mr Hugh Hanley
Mr Ben Hodges
Ms Yijie Huang
Mr Soundararajan Jagdish
Mr Pheeraphone Jampee

Mr Cosmin Koszor
Mr Nicholas Leah
Ms Sundeep Lidher
Ms Vanessa Lim
Mr Andrea Mancini
Mr Mario Maritan
Mr Shaun McGuiness
Mr Daniel McKay
Mr Brandon Munda
Mr Jack Newman
Mr Thom Pritchard
Mr Xiaoping Qi
Ms Roseanna Ramsden
Ms Claire Rioult
Ms Jayne Shaw
Ms Johanna Sinclair
Mr Stuart Smedley
Mr Stuart Smith
Ms Therese Sunga
Mr Travis Weinger
Ms Shamara Wettimuny
Ms Amanda Williams
Mr Tom Zago
THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

• **REPRESENTS** history as a discipline, and historians as a group

• **PROMOTES** the vitality of historical scholarship through support for research and publication

• **ADVOCATES** best practice in history teaching in universities and schools

• **PROVIDES** a forum for all historians to meet and exchange ideas

• **SUPPORTS** and encourages early career historians