## Contents

- President’s Letter • 1
- Changes at the RHS Office • 4
- A New Era for *Transactions* • 6
- Lectures & Meetings in 2022 • 8
- Society Publishing: ‘New Historical Perspectives’ on Professional Precarity and Women’s Suffrage
- UKRI Open Access Protocols: What they Mean for Historians • 17
- Support in Early Career: ‘Positive Action’ Workshop for Historians of Colour • 19
- Support in Early Career: ‘New to Teaching’ Conference, 2021 • 21
- Reading History Online • 23
- New Research Fellows, 2021-22 • 25
- G.W. Prothero in the Archive • 28
- Newly Elected Fellows, 2020-21 • 31
Taking up the Society’s Presidency in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic, I was under no illusion that my first year was unlikely to be one of business as usual. Yet even in the context of uncertainty and flux posed by a switch to virtual working, the past year has thrown up some unwelcome surprises. Ministerial attacks on individual historians, on the museum and heritage sector at large, and on ‘low value degrees’ in the humanities have each created a divisive, heavily politicised atmosphere.

What has concerned me most, however, has been the series of announcements regarding the closure of History departments throughout the country. The closure at Sunderland in 2020 turned out to be the canary in the coalmine, rather than an aberration. During 2021 we have seen the end of the History degree at London South Bank University, the closure of the History department at Kingston University, the proposed closure of History at Aston University (thankfully reprieved), and now a new restructuring proposal that yet again involves redundancies in History, this time at Goldsmiths, University of London. Together these experiences suggest that the problem is systemic. The combination of a universal student fee and uncapped student numbers is having the predictable consequence of selected universities over-recruiting students on courses that are cheap to deliver, to the detriment of their smaller, less ‘prestigious’ neighbours. The consequence is the turbulence throughout the sector that we are currently witnessing.
This unfortunate turn of events brings to relief the purpose of a learned society. Uniquely among organisations interested in History, the Royal Historical Society exists to sustain the discipline and support professional historians. As a national and international membership organisation, the RHS works alongside, while sitting separate from, university departments and other institutions where historians practice their craft. We speak for the discipline and the historical profession. We highlight the negative implications of cuts for individual historians, local communities of current and future students, and our broader historical understanding—at a time when this is needed more than ever.

“This unfortunate turn of events brings to relief the purpose of a learned society. Uniquely among organisations interested in History, the Royal Historical Society exists to sustain the discipline and support professional historians. As a national and international membership organisation, the RHS works alongside, while sitting separate from, university departments and other institutions where historians practice their craft. We speak for the discipline and the historical profession. We highlight the negative implications of cuts for individual historians, local communities of current and future students, and our broader historical understanding—at a time when this is needed more than ever.”

This year the Society has contacted affected departments and—where requested—written to senior management teams, arguing for the benefits of strong and effective History provision. We have offered assistance to those whose livelihoods are put at risk, used the media to publicise our concerns, and joined with other disciplinary groups to speak out. As a specialist and experienced community we are able to speak authoritatively about the distinctiveness and strength of specific departments, and what’s required to maintain a successful teaching and research culture when cuts are threatened. Information is central here, and we seek the experience of those in the field. Currently we’re collecting data to help improve our understanding of the sector and the challenges it faces, as—regrettably—the situation does not look likely to improve any time soon.

At the same time as advocating for History, we must not lose sight of our traditional functions as a learned society—promoting research and scholarship, sponsoring lectures and symposia, awarding research grants and prizes, and supporting a wide range of publications. The Society has pursued activities in each of these areas over the past twelve months, about all of which you can read more in this Newsletter and on the RHS website.

We have also responded to circumstances and established new programmes. This year, with growing concern about the insecurities faced by those starting their professional lives, we have added several initiatives for early career historians. In February 2021 the Society launched its new Early Career Fellowships, designed to support career-building research activities for postdoctoral researchers without a permanent position. The scheme has proved extremely popular among those seeking support to complete defined projects, such as a book proposal or first article. Demand has greatly exceeded the number of fellowships we were able to award this year, and we are now exploring options to continue the fellowships with new strands of funding.

In July 2021 the Society also launched an annual series of online workshops for researchers who’ve recently completed a PhD or will soon do so. These workshops offer...
“In recognition that a great many historians work outside universities, we have sought this year to expand our definition of the ‘professional historian’. By modifying our criteria for RHS fellowship and membership, we have been able to welcome historians from a wider range of backgrounds.”

In order to sustain the Society’s activities in an ever wider and more complex sphere, we have also made significant changes to our office structure this year, most notably with the recruitment of the Society’s first CEO, Adam Hughes, who introduces himself and describes these changes in greater detail in the article that follows. We have also made substantial alterations to the operation of our journal, Transactions. As with our monograph series, ‘New Historical Perspectives’, the Camden Series and the Bibliography of British and Irish History, we are introducing an arm’s-length principle, with the journal’s editorial work now being undertaken by external editors rather than trustees who sit on Council. You can read more about this new phase for the journal later in the Newsletter. My especial thanks are owing to Andrew Spicer and Richard Toye for their phenomenal service since 2015 and 2016 respectively as the last of the Society’s Literary Directors, and for helping us oversee this transition.

We also say a goodbye and thank you to those who will be leaving Council at this year’s AGM, held on 26 November: Alana Harris, after three years’ service as the Society’s Honorary Secretary, and Oleg Benesch, Clare Griffiths and Paul Readman, whose terms as councillors come to an end. In their place we welcome three new Council members, Stefan Bauer, Caitriona Beaumont and Emilie Murphy. I look forward to working with them—along with the whole of Council, RHS staff, and the Society’s membership—to help support and promote History and historians through 2022 and beyond.

Emma Griffin is President of the Royal Historical Society and Professor of Modern British History at the University of East Anglia. To contact Emma about the Society and its work please email: president@royalhistsoc.org
Changes at the RHS Office

Adam Hughes, the Society’s new Chief Executive Officer, reports on changes to the RHS Office and governance.

In October I was delighted to be appointed as the first Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Royal Historical Society. My appointment came shortly after the recruitment of two further Society posts—the Academic Director, Philip Carter, and Membership & Office Administrator, Lisa Linossi—and marks the completion of an important restructure of the Society’s office function instigated more than a year ago.

In 2020 the then President, Margot Finn, and President Elect, Emma Griffin, commissioned a wide-ranging review of the Society’s office and associated activities. Its purpose was to ensure the RHS was equipped to continue and extend its work in as effective and robust a fashion as possible. The 2020 review proposed that the Society move from its existing ‘back office’ model of committed administrative staff, to a structure akin to that deployed by other learned societies. Recommendations included the recruitment of staff to provide organisational and operational infrastructure—necessary for the Society to pursue its charitable mission—together with specialist oversight in areas often beyond the experience of academic trustees, or requiring a level of commitment not possible for councillors holding university ‘day jobs’.

With this in mind, I would like to introduce myself and my colleagues, as the new team at the Society’s central office based at University College London. As Chief Executive, I hold responsibility for the overall direction of the Society’s newly reconstituted professional office. I’ll work in close collaboration with the President and other Society trustees and committee members to lead on key areas of the Society and its development: most particularly those relating to governance, membership, external relations, fundraising, financial planning/management, and strategy.

Many Fellows and Members will already be familiar with Dr Philip Carter, the Society’s new Academic Director who joined in March 2021 from the Institute of Historical Research, University of London. Philip manages the Society’s academic agenda, with a focus on policy and advocacy work, events, prizes, publishing and publisher liaison, institutional partnerships, the RHS library and archive, communications and the Society’s digital presence. Later in this Newsletter, Philip outlines changes to Transactions, the RHS journal, which now welcomes submissions from all historians and to which we are currently recruiting a new editorial board.

The final member of the RHS Office is Lisa Linossi, who joined the Society in June 2021. Lisa is responsible for the administration of our fellowship and membership schemes, requests for grants and entries to the Society’s portfolio of prizes, and administration of a number of the Society’s committees. Lisa will be the primary contact for the majority of Fellows and Members, and will support you in your association with the Society.
In addition to working with the Society’s membership, Lisa, Philip and myself will create space and time for the RHS Council and its committees to focus on engaging creatively and strategically with those topics historians consider important, in areas such as publishing, research policy, education and early career support.

As Emma has already outlined in this Newsletter, the historical community currently faces a number of challenges. It’s the intention of the RHS Office to help trustees and members best confront these—ensuring both the Society’s efficiency and sustainability, and its selection and implementation of strategic priorities for the years ahead.

Adam Hughes is CEO of the Royal Historical Society. To contact Adam please email: adam.hughes@royalhistsoc.org

Above: The Society’s newly appointed CEO, Adam Hughes.
2022 marks the 150th anniversary of the creation of the RHS journal, Transactions. Introducing its first volume in 1872, the Society’s founder Charles Rogers explained the journal’s role as being the ‘reproduction and illustration of rare historical tracts’, and the recovery ‘of materials which might illustrate the less explored paths of national and provincial history.’

Since Rogers’ words, Transactions has developed in step with the discipline and historical profession, and is presently undertaking the latest phase in this evolution. These developments are twofold. First, Transactions is now open to submissions from all historians—not just those (as previously) who delivered lectures to the Society. If you are currently working on an article, please do consider Transactions as one of the journals in which you might publish your work. The second change for Transactions is the move to a new editorial structure. To date, responsibility for the journal has fallen to the Society’s two Literary Directors who also sit on the Council. From February 2022, editorial responsibility moves to two new academic Editors who will report to but are independent of Council. They will be supported by an editorial board of historians based in both the UK and overseas, as well as by the RHS Office. This new era for Transactions encompasses a fresh look. In 2022, we will develop a new format, image and branding for Transactions. Thereafter we anticipate moving from a single annual print volume to more frequent issues, available in paperback as well as online-only formats. There will also be changes between the covers—notably the inclusion of a wider range of article types and lengths. As readers of academic journals, we’re all seeing greater experimentation in publishing formats married to subject matter. This is an exciting development and one to which Transactions will now also contribute.
This encouragement of new formats will be matched by greater breadth of content, as befits the range of concerns the Royal Historical Society represents. In addition to traditional research articles, the Editors will encourage submissions on historical practice, methodologies and pedagogy; on the status of the discipline and its future; and from historians working in sectors other than higher education and at the intersection between academia and these fields. The aim is a blend of articles that—in content, approach and form—better reflects the Society, the interests of members, and those it supports and serves.

The common thread in these changes is making Transactions more accessible and open, both in terms of those able to participate—as editors and contributors—and the range of topics with which the journal will engage. This, moreover, is a priority informing work across the Society. It’s most notable in the broadening of RHS membership, via a more expansive understanding of ‘contribution to historical scholarship’ for the fellowship, as well as modifications to membership categories to address the needs of historians from a range of backgrounds and career stages. Greater openness likewise informs the Society’s recent move to a more variegated events programme; one that accommodates more occasional sessions (including debates, book launches, international speakers and workshops) and sits alongside the established series of annual lectures.

If 2022 brings change and new opportunities to Transactions, it’s worth noting how the journal’s founding aims and values continue to resonate. Writing in 1872, Charles Rogers first championed Transactions as a publication in which scholars could chart and navigate the ‘less explored paths’ of History. Many have since done so.

150 years on, we hope this next phase in the journal’s evolution enables current and future historians to continue these investigations. There are still many paths to tread.

Philip Carter is the Society’s Academic Director.

For information on submitting an article to Transactions, see: royalhistsoc.org/publications/transactions/

The 2021 volume of Transactions (volume 31, sixth series) is published in print and online in November 2021. Volume 31 includes articles by Shahmima Akhtar on revisiting Race, Ethnicity & Equality; Linda Colley, on printing written constitutions; Simon Ditchfield on ‘Baroque around the Clock .... Uses of Global History‘; and Margot Finn on material turns and cancel cultures.
LECTURES & MEETINGS, 2022

Friday 4 February 2022
Professor Andrew Jotischky (Royal Holloway, London)
‘Monks and the Muslim Enemy: Conversion, Polemic and Resistance in Monastic Hagiography in the Age of the Crusades, c.1000-1250’

Tuesday 8 March 2022
Workshop for Early Career Historians: I

Friday 6 May 2022
Professor Toby Green (King’s College, London)
‘English Traders, Sao Tome, and the Birth of the Sugar Complex in West-Central Africa, c.1600-1640’

Friday 1 July 2022
The Prothero Lecture: Professor Rowan McWilliam (Anglia Ruskin)
‘The Gaiety Girl and the Matinee Idol: Constructing Celebrity and Sexuality in the West End of London, 1880-1914’

Thursday 14 July 2022
Workshop for Early Career Historians: II
‘Applying History: a Guide to Employment in History beyond Academia’

Friday 16 September 2022
Dr Su Sin Lewis (Bristol)
‘Socialism and Decolonisation in Southeast Asia’

September 2022
The Gerald Aylmer Seminar, for Historians and Archivists
In association with the Institute of Historical Research and The National Archives

Tuesday 1 November 2022
Colin Matthew Memorial Lecture for the Public Understanding of History:
Kavita Puri (BBC)
‘Partition of British India: 75 years on’
In association with Gresham College, London

Friday 25 November 2022
RHS Presidential Address: Professor Emma Griffin
‘Experiments in Digital History. Using the Census and Computing to Study Nineteenth-Century Britain’

Tuesday 6 December 2022
Workshop for Early Career Historians: III
‘Communicating History: a Guide to Broadcasting your Research’
Society Publishing: ‘New Historical Perspectives’ on Professional Precarity and Women’s Suffrage

Two recent edited collections from the Society’s ‘New Historical Perspectives’ series offer insights on precarity and the rise of the professions, and introduce new work on suffrage and grassroots activism. Contributors to both volumes argue for the value of historical examples in understanding and addressing contemporary inequalities.

In the first of two articles, Heidi Egginton and Zoë Thomas introduce their collection, Precarious Professionals. Gender, Identities and Social Change in Modern Britain (October 2021).

We started working on Precarious Professionals in the autumn of 2014, when we were both exploring the role of women and gender in creative professions in Britain during the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In our own research into the Arts and Crafts movement and the antiques trade we kept coming across examples of women who had defied conventional ideas about professional work. These individuals had claimed and adapted professional identities as art workers, writers, interior designers, and valuers despite often being excluded from the same professional spaces, training, associations or qualifications as their male counterparts. We wondered: were these artistic women simply unconventional, or would we find similar stories in different fields and—if so—how would that change the way historians have tended to conceptualise professional identity?

Together, we mined careers advice handbooks and interviews with self-described professionals, such as the Cambridge journalist Margaret Bateson’s Professional Women upon Their Professions (1895). Bateson showed that, in an era before women were legally allowed to enter conventional professions, and in which the term ‘woman professional’ still registered as a contradiction in terms, women were nevertheless capably assuming new identities in fields as diverse as dentistry, ballet dancing, and stockbroking. She aimed to challenge
her readers’ assumption that ‘the choice for a young woman of good education and belongings lies between complete ... obscurity on the one hand and the very highest distinctions ... on the other.’ Yet women who engaged in professional forms of work in this period continue to be seen today typically as exceptional pioneers, struggling parvenus, or members of so-called ‘semi-professions’—categories which the research by contributors to *Precarious Professionals* reveals to be far more complex.

There has been a tendency to discuss the meanings of professionalism by focusing on a narrow pool of traditional, male-dominated professions and linear career trajectories. Taking as the standard model professions like medicine or law—in which access to formal training, accreditation and professional institutions guaranteed secure employment and closed off opportunities for the unqualified—divides workers into professional ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, often along gendered lines. The cultural biases which support these power imbalances are well-documented: in science, for example, the ‘Matthew Matilda effect’ describes the phenomenon where work by more eminent men is often judged to be stronger than that by lower-ranking women, even if it is produced collaboratively. The economic and social historian Joan Thirsk coined ‘Thirsk’s Law’ to highlight how the development of every occupation tended to proceed on the basis of gender equality until it was ‘institutionalised, formalised, and organised’—thereafter its direction and style inevitably fell ‘under the control of men’.

In publishing this edited collection we wanted to showcase cutting-edge new work by scholars which historicised the structural inequalities based on gender, as well as intersectional categories including class, race and age, faced by different ‘precarious professionals’. The book brings together new research into lives on the margins of a wider range of careers than hitherto considered—considering ballet dancers, art critics, and art workers as well as scientists, lawyers, politicians, secretaries, writers, teachers, historians, humanitarian relief workers, social researchers and Cold War diplomats, amongst others—from the 1840s to the 1960s, the era which classic social histories call ‘the rise of professional society’. Our book excavates the messy, complicated working lives of more unconventional professionals, alongside
considering those active in traditional fields such as law in a new light. Furthermore, several chapters analyse how men utilised, benefited from, and rejected different masculine ideals of professionalism. In so doing, it reveals that precarity was a thread woven throughout the fabric of modern professional life from its inception, although the forms in which this played out were markedly shaped by individual circumstances and historical contexts. Ultimately, it expands our conceptions of professional identity for different women and men in the past and shows how working lives might be more equitably reimagined in the future.

We tackled these questions during a period in which gender, precarity, and professional identity came to the forefront of debates not only in women’s history, but in cultural heritage, social research and popular culture. As we prepared the manuscript for submission in autumn 2020, the UK government was forced, following widespread condemnation, to scrap an advert for its CyberFirst campaign featuring a young dancer tying up her ballet shoes with the caption ‘Fatima’s next job could be in cyber. (She just doesn’t know it yet.)’ As well as serving as a talking point for discussions on the challenges faced by young people, freelancers, and working women more widely during the pandemic, the criticism provoked by this particular advert emphasises the ongoing importance of questioning and resisting the forces that devalue different professional fields, and the centrality of gender and race to these debates.

The point of contention here was not whether a dancer’s skillset prepares them for a job in coding (indeed it would, quite admirably, according to many dance commentators at the time), but why ‘Fatima’, a young, highly-skilled woman of colour, should be expected to give up her chosen profession to retrain in what is currently deemed a more marketable occupation. The advert and the debate it sparked help illuminate the complex emotions, ideals, and insecurities which swirl around the world of professional work and the perennially precarious place of certain people within it. Many of the institutions and associations of contemporary professional society experienced a reckoning with precarity during the period in which this book was compiled. Enlivened by global social movements exposing inequalities and hidden power hierarchies like #MeToo, the ongoing struggle for the rights of LGBTQ+ people, and Black Lives Matter, a variety of work is currently taking place to address discrimination in education, training and advancement in the professions—led in our own field by the Royal Historical Society. We hope Precarious Professionals provides a timely contribution to these ongoing academic and public discussions about power, meritocracy and expertise. Publishing an edited collection
“Ultimately, it expands our conceptions of professional identity for different women and men in the past and shows how working lives might be more equitably reimagined in the future.”

about professional identity in the Society’s ‘New Historical Perspectives’ series was the perfect project to accompany our own progression from doctoral researchers to work as historians in the different fields of archives and academia. We highly recommend the series to other early career researchers. We would also like to acknowledge the encouragement and support of everyone who worked on the manuscript with such commitment and patience at the Institute of Historical Research and University of London Press, who partner on the series; of Leslie Howsam, Peter Mandler, Penny Summerfield, and the anonymous peer reviewers at the Royal Historical Society, whose insight helped us shape the project in its early stages; and all the inspiring historians who contributed chapters to the book. We hope you enjoy reading it as much as we enjoyed collaborating on it.

Dr Heidi Egginton is Curator of Political Collections at the National Library of Scotland.
Dr Zoë Thomas is Associate Professor in Modern History at the University of Birmingham.
In this second ‘NHP’ feature Alexandra Hughes-Johnson and Lyndsey Jenkins, editors of The Politics of Women’s Suffrage. Local, National and International Dimensions, focus on the campaign for enfranchisement as episodes in daily life.

The 2018 commemoration of the centenary of the Representation of the People Act generated huge public interest in the suffrage movement. It prompted exhibitions, plays, tours, statues and parades, many bedecked with the purple, white and green of the most famous suffragette organisation. But the centenary was also a time to reflect on the meaning and significance of the campaign for women’s suffrage, which went far beyond a single piece of legislation.

The suffrage movement represented the most significant and radical challenge to the constitution since 1832. Those involved sought to fundamentally alter the terms on which politics was conducted, by expanding and redefining the basis of citizenship. For decades prior to 1918, women had engaged in a political movement that sought to utilize and reconstruct the political system. The intention was to transform women’s place, status and prospects in other spheres, and so create a better and more equal world for women and girls.

In our new book—The Politics of Women’s Suffrage: Local National and International Dimensions—we seek to resituate the suffrage cause first and foremost as a political movement, reaffirming Karen Offen’s insistence that the history of feminism is political history. Women’s political claims were inseparable from other contemporary political debates around home rule, workers’ rights, imperial relationships and male suffrage. But women’s politics did not only take place in the parliamentary chamber, the town meeting or the street corner. Rather, politics was embedded in women’s everyday lives. Women’s activism was linked to their life experiences and negotiated in relation to other commitments, including family obligations, friendship networks, and the demands of paid work and domestic labour.

The thirteen chapters in The Politics of Women’s Suffrage examine how campaigners sought to achieve lasting structural change by navigating, interrogating, challenging and remaking the existing political system. Women attempted to redefine the nature of the political itself: shifting not only how politics was conducted and how the political system functioned, but also what counted as political.

One set of contributions focuses on how women worked within existing political structures. Jen Redmond, for example, demonstrates how women in Ireland utilised petitions as a campaigning tactic, while demonstrating that Irish political representatives took a far earlier and more prominent role in the debates than is usually recognised. Anna Muggeridge’s new analysis of the grassroots infant welfare movement reminds us that suffrage was only one of many political goals for women at this time.
A second set of essays examines how women sought to further their political objectives through social and cultural structures. Sos Eltis analyses how women brought their interpretations of class politics to literature and the arts, using writing and performance as a tool to confront the class structure as well as the gender order. Helen Sunderland takes the politics of suffrage into the classroom, conceptualising the school as a political community which encompassed pupils and alumni as well as teachers, and demonstrating the political capabilities of children through their own involvement in suffrage.

A third and final set of chapters examine how women worked within international political structures to achieve their objectives. Sharon Crozier-De Rosa points to new ways of writing political history in which emotions are made central through her investigation of suffrage and anti-suffrage relationships across the British Empire. Kate Connelly reconceptualises the East End of London not as a one-off experiment but as inspired by existing radical politics in settlement houses and trade unions in America, insisting on the importance of feminist institution buildings. Susan Grayzel thinks through the importance of maternalism, militarism, and imperialism by placing the British suffrage campaign within a broader global history of women’s politics. Nicoletta Gullace concludes the collection comparing how the centennial celebrations of 2018 varied in Britain and America: not only paying close attention to the politics of race, but reminding us that democracy remains very much a work-in-progress.

Commemorations in 2018 took place against a turbulent political backdrop in which questions of gendered power and
exploitation proved ever present. At the time, these were exemplified by the #MeToo and #TimesUp campaigns, and ranged from concerns about period poverty to the status of women housed at Yarl's Wood, alongside a recognition of the disproportionate impact of austerity on women. In the few years since, the global pandemic has only exacerbated gendered inequalities, as the economic impact and caring responsibilities fell disproportionately on women, reduced women’s access to essential healthcare services—especially during pregnancy and childbirth—and saw a massive increase in domestic violence: all of which were magnified by racial and economic disparities. The appalling and ongoing demonstrations of institutional misogyny in the police are the latest reminder that the pandemic is far from the only crisis affecting women’s lives: our basic right to safety is still not secure.

It is easy to feel isolated and hopeless at these times. But fundamentally, the chapters that make up The Politics of Women’s Suffrage serve as a reminder of the power of the collective and the need for long-term commitment to structural change. Just as suffrage was inseparable from other claims around women’s rights, education, work and family life, so today claims for women’s liberation and justice cannot be separated from broader demands for global justice: whether racial, environmental, economic, or in terms of healthcare. Suffrage campaigners understood the importance of active citizenship, political participation and grassroots organisation. Their legacy remains vitally relevant today.

Alexandra Hughes-Johnson is a Research Associate at the University of Oxford and a Research Portfolio Manager at the ESRC, UK Research and Innovation. Lyndsey Jenkins is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at Queen Mary, University of London.
I never met a Tory tul I was fourteen. One of them was leafleting up in a scheme in Bellshill. I remember looking at him as if to say you look just like us. It was the safest Labour seat in Scotland, North Lanarkshire.

The infant was swaddled to varying degrees of tightness to fix its shape, as newly-born bones were believed to be waxy with moisture from the womb. This binding completed its separation from its mother.

Avalanches of Snow were fallen, and had made terrible Havock; there was nothing to be seen but Trees torn up by the Roots, and large Stones, which seemed to lie without any Support...
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UKRI Open Access Protocols: What they Mean for Historians

Professor Jane Winters, the Society’s Vice-President, Publications, reports on a recent announcement from UK Research & Innovation.

Image credit: Cyle De Guzman on Unsplash
On 6 August 2021, UK Research & Innovation (UKRI) published its long-awaited report outlining its future approach to Open Access (OA) publishing. The protocols developed will not affect all published research in the UK, but are specifically concerned with outputs arising from activity funded by the seven research councils that come under UKRI’s remit. For historians that’s principally activities funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). Some aspects of the protocols will be familiar to anyone who has published a peer-reviewed journal article in recent years, but there are some important changes to be aware of, not least the extension of OA requirements to monographs, book chapters and edited collections published on or after 1 January 2024 (with some important exceptions).

Turning first to journal articles, it remains the case that there are two routes to compliance with UKRI’s OA requirements for peer-reviewed work. The first of these routes involves the immediate OA publication of the Version of Record (VoR) of an article in a journal or via another kind of publishing platform. This often, although not always, involves the payment of an Article Processing Charge (APC), funding for which will still be available via the UKRI block grant. The second route involves publishing the article in a subscription journal and depositing a version (either the Author Accepted Manuscript [AAM] or the Version of Record, depending on what the journal publisher will allow) in an institutional or subject repository. It will still be possible to argue that the most permissive CC-BY licence is not appropriate in such cases, if the author can justify an exception. A key change, however, is the removal of the embargo period—previously 12 to 24 months from the date of publication—for the OA version published in a repository.

The extension of OA requirements to many kinds of book is likely to be the most significant policy development affecting historians, following UKRI’s August announcement. In a little over two years’ time, for monographs, book chapters and edited collections arising from UKRI-funded projects (although not doctoral research), the AAM / VoR should be deposited in an institutional or subject repository, with an embargo period of no more than 12 months. A CC-BY licence is preferred, but more restrictive licensing will be permitted.

In addition to books arising from PhD studentships, forms of output excluded from these new criteria include scholarly editions, exhibition catalogues, scholarly illustrated catalogues, textbooks, fictional works and creative writing and trade books. The decision as to what constitutes a trade book is left to authors / publishers, and will no doubt result in some interesting conversations. It should be noted that if a trade book is the sole output of a UKRI-funded project, it will fall within the scope of the protocols.

These are significant changes, and some of the detail is still emerging, but they relate to a limited subset of work published by historians—that supported by UKRI—and there is a commitment to funding their implementation. The Society remains closely engaged with OA developments that concern all of our communities.

A longer summary, and initial analysis, of UKRI’s announcement was published in August as part of Historical Transactions, the Society’s blog. Further updates will appear in Historical Transactions and via the Society’s Twitter channel as remaining questions are addressed by UKRI.
Support in Early Career: ‘Positive Action’ Workshop for Historians of Colour

Many RHS activities focus on supporting historians in the early stages of their careers: finishing a PhD, navigating the uncertain postdoctoral world, or beginning an academic position. In one of two articles on this theme, Diya Gupta and Jonathan Saha describe the Society’s first ‘positive action’ workshop for early career historians of colour.

In August 2021 members of the Society’s Race, Ethnicity and Equality Working Group hosted ‘Applying for an academic job: a workshop for ECR historians of colour’. This day-long event offered a collaborative training and skills-focused programme, comprising one-to-one mentoring sessions on CV writing—provided by established academics, in conversation with early-career historians of colour. The workshop then moved to a panel discussion on cover letters and postdoctoral applications, and concluded with a wide-ranging Q&A session. As an exercise in ‘positive action’, the event broke new ground in the interventions the Working Group is making in race equality work.

For this first event of its kind, we limited numbers to 30 to provide those attending with sufficient time and space for discussion. It came as no surprise that the event was oversubscribed within 48 hours. We’re well aware of the extent to which Black, Asian and other minority ethnic historians of colour are underrepresented in UK History departments. As the Society’s 2018 Race Report also made clear, BME historians often experience isolation and the lack of mentors. As a result, there’s a real need to create supportive environments that empower early career historians of colour to make competitive applications for postdoctoral opportunities and academic jobs. Only then can History’s academic ‘pipeline’ change. The Society’s workshop offered one step towards this goal.

The one-to-one sessions we ran in August could not, of course, provide the benefits that derive from longer-term mentoring relationships. Nonetheless, through these pairings we were able to pass on the collective experience of five historians—Sadiah Qureshi, Kennetta Hammond Perry, Margot Finn, Meleisa Ono-George and Rob Waters—who joined us for the event.

In the subsequent panel discussion, our starting focus on cover letters and postdoctoral research proposals gave way to a much more expansive conversation. There followed a lively discussion in which attendees contributed directly or submitted candid questions anonymously. We gained a real sense of a cohort of talented historians on the threshold of what could be stunning careers, all of whom currently face a daunting higher education environment.

Events like the RHS workshop, tailored to particular unrepresented groups, are vital in correcting the premise that there’s a deficit
that needs to be overcome within communities historically marginalised from academia. This is a view we frequently encounter but has little basis in fact. Bespoke workshops like ours, drawing on and responding to participants’ experiences, are about removing barriers that do not exist for people from more privileged groups. These barriers might result from a non-traditional career path; from unfamiliarity with the postdoctoral environment, on account of being a first-generation university student; or are based in experiences of hostility and everyday racism—all-too-common in institutions of learning.

The response of those attending the August workshop was overwhelmingly positive. One participant spoke of how much she’d appreciated detailed, informed advice on CV writing, and how the mentoring session had enabled her to raise specific concerns frankly with a fellow woman of colour. For others, it was the discussion time that proved most significant. This was much better than ‘being talked at’, providing an opportunity to hear and learn from others on equal terms. Those attending also welcomed opportunities to get to know one another, and to have time during the day to discuss early career experiences among themselves. This is certainly a dimension we will bear in mind for future iterations of the programme.

The Society’s first mentoring event was inevitably a small step, but also an important and successful one. Discussion of the workshop will hopefully encourage other institutions to identify and remove barriers to historians of colour seeking an academic career. We also look forward to its becoming a feature of the RHS programme.

Dr Diya Gupta is RHS Past & Present Fellow, Race, Ethnicity and Equality in History. Dr Jonathan Saha is an Associate Professor in South Asian History at Durham University.

“There’s a real need to create supportive environments that empower early career historians of colour to make competitive applications for postdoctoral opportunities and academic jobs.”
Support in Early Career: ‘New to Teaching’ Conference, 2021

In a second article on supporting early career historians, Peter D’Sena describes how the Society’s 2021 ‘New to Teaching’ Conference moved online to consider the digital classroom.

‘New to Teaching’ offers early career historians guidance and support on linking pedagogic theory to professional practice. A staple of the Society’s annual calendar, this July the conference moved online to review 12 months of remote teaching during the pandemic. As we’ve all found, online sessions—while limiting those often productive, incidental conversations—also enable higher levels of attendance. ‘New to Teaching’ 2021 was no exception, attracting 200 History PhD students, postdocs, early career researchers and newly appointed lecturers over two half-day sessions.

Participants explored key issues relating to teaching History in higher education, from innovations in teaching and learning—including new forms of online delivery, and curriculum design—to running seminar groups and preparing for the academic job market. Workshops were delivered by a group of highly experienced and innovative teachers of History in HE, who used a blend of live and pre-recorded presentations.

Central to this year’s proceedings was our exploration of how external drivers, such as the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), connect to the practice of what and how we teach History in and beyond the classroom. Elaine Fulton (Birmingham)—currently leading the team rewriting the QAA History Benchmark Statement—provided a session on curriculum design. Jamie Wood (Lincoln) spoke on the pedagogic principles that best inform the design of courses in History. In subsequent sessions presenters discussed the complex digital space that teachers and students now inhabit. Katie Carpenter (Lincoln) provided necessary advice on ‘Preparing for the unexpected for online teaching’; Jon Chandler (UCL) offered a guide to ‘Team Teaching: Tips, Tricks and Techniques’; while Lucinda Matthews-Jones (Liverpool John Moores) explored the benefits of ‘Jamboarding … (to enhance) seminar participation in the digital classroom’. These speakers—along with Marcus Collins (Loughborough) and others—have played a leading role in the creation of History UK’s Pandemic Pedagogy Handbook, another essential guide on moving teaching online.
Other new-look presentations for 2021 included those by the History teacher-educators David Ingledew (Hertfordshire) and Will Bailey-Watson (Reading)—on addressing academic and pastoral concerns facing students moving from school to university—and Shahmima Akhtar (Royal Holloway) and Antonella Liuzzo-Scorpo (Lincoln) on ‘Decolonising the curriculum in practice’. A final set of sessions revisited popular conference topics in the context of our growing engagement with digital tools. These included Max Jones (Manchester) on ‘The history lecture’, Jamie Wood on ‘Small group teaching’, and Catherine Armstrong (Loughborough) on ‘Teaching and building your academic career’.

As a support for historians building careers at a time of flux, ‘New to Teaching’ has never been more necessary. We will return in 2022 with a revised programme shaped by and responsive to our rapidly evolving online environment.

**Peter D’Sena** is Vice-President, Education, at the Royal Historical Society and an Associate Professor of Learning and Teaching at the University of Hertfordshire.

_In the next article, read about Jamie Wood’s current research project, ‘Reading History Online’, for which he received the RHS Innovation in Teaching Award, 2021._

And there’s more on early career support later in the Newsletter, when the Society’s four research fellows for 2021-22 introduce the doctoral research they’ll complete as Centenary and Marshall Fellows.
If we know one thing about studying History at university, it’s that it involves a lot of reading. As teachers, we regularly grapple with the challenge of engaging students with unfamiliar and inaccessible texts. In response we have developed a range of approaches to help them become better readers. The shift of most teaching online during lockdown, alongside the increasing prevalence of digital technologies for reading, has challenged historians to consider how we can help our students to become better readers.

Over the past few years, I have experimented with various approaches to engage students in reading sources online in preparation for class. I have found that technology can be a really powerful support, when coupled with a structured pedagogic approach. Most recently, when designing a new final-year undergraduate module in 2018, I was keen to get students reading some rather obscure primary texts. I found a tool, Talis Elevate, that enabled me to upload readings to a shared space where students could collectively annotate them as part of their preparations for class.

So, how does it work? Generally, students are asked to post at least three comments (questions, points of interest, responses to peers) on the weekly primary source in Talis Elevate (disclaimer: other tools can do a similar job). I rarely reply to student comments. Online readings therefore become a space for independent student work and interaction.

I read the comments and use them to plan activities and select sources for focused reading in class—seminars are directly informed by student interests and not driven by what I think they should be interested in. During the pandemic, I made extensive use of Microsoft 365 documents to enable students to engage with shorter source extracts in online seminars, further focusing the module on collaborative annotation. Quantitative and qualitative feedback has consistently indicated high levels of engagement with this approach. Students have expressed an appreciation of the opportunities that are provided for interaction and discussion of challenging texts and really like the fact that their annotations feed directly into seminars, with a positive effect on engagement in class (far more so than in a traditional ‘read for seminar and then discuss’ approach).
Historians at the University of Lincoln, and elsewhere, have also engaged enthusiastically with the collaborative annotation approach using Talis Elevate. It’s proven particularly important during lockdown, with significantly increased levels of engagement when teaching shifted fully online after March 2020. Furthermore, historians have acted as catalysts for uptake in other disciplines. At Lincoln, and other universities, historians have been at the forefront of innovative reading pedagogies for online reading.

As a result of this work, I recently started leading, alongside Anna Rich-Abad (Nottingham) and Jon Chandler (UCL), a QAA-funded project, ‘Active Online Reading’, that aims to develop pedagogies for digital reading in higher education. The project seeks to enhance our understanding of how students read and analyse texts online, and will further underline how historians lead teaching innovation across and beyond the sector.

As part of the ‘Active Online Reading’ project, Anna, Jon and myself are launching two surveys designed to gather feedback from students on how they read online, and from academics and other staff on how they teach students to read online.

We would like to invite members of the Royal Historical Society to complete the survey and share it with their colleagues and students. The Student Survey is open to all undergraduate and postgraduate students, and we welcome responses from within and beyond the UK. You’ll find links to both surveys at the end of this article.

Tools such as Talis Elevate also help us understand how our students read, and provide a powerful means of improving how we teach them to do so. Because I can observe the kinds of things that my students comment on when annotating documents, I am able to gain some insights into what they have found interesting, or difficult, and adjust my approach accordingly.

Jamie Wood is Professor of History and Education at the University of Lincoln, and winner of the RHS’s Award for Teaching Innovation, 2021.

Jamie was one of eight winners of prizes for publishing, research and teaching at the 2021 RHS Awards, held in July this year. For a more on the 2021 prizes, winners and runners-up, and the call for the 2022 awards see: royalhistsoc.org/prizes/

For more on Jamie’s ‘Active Online Reading’ project see: makingdigitalhistory.co.uk. The surveys that form part of the project are available at (Staff) bit.ly/3ltPX7m and (Students): bit.ly/3oPOnyJ
New Research Fellows 2021-22

This summer four doctoral research students were appointed to RHS Centenary and Marshall Fellowships for 2021-22, held jointly with the Institute of Historical Research. Here the Society’s new research fellows introduce themselves and their work.

Dan Armstrong (St Andrews), RHS Centenary Fellow: October 2021-March 2022
‘Anglo-Papal Relations, c.1066-c.1135’

I am a PhD student at the University of St Andrews, funded by the European Research Council as part of the project ‘Civil Law, Common Law, Customary Law: Consonance, Divergence and Transformation in Western Europe from the late eleventh to the thirteenth centuries’. My PhD is entitled ‘Anglo-Papal Relations, c.1066-c.1135’ and I’m supervised by Professor John Hudson.

My research focuses on the relationship between England and Rome during the reigns of William I, William II and Henry I. The last comprehensive study of this topic was made ninety years ago by Z.N. Brooke, and his work still provides the main interpretative framework for our understanding of Anglo-Papal relations in this period. Consequently, though the grand narrative of conflict between church and state has been demolished in the wider field of papal studies, it continues to frame ideas surrounding Anglo-Papal relations. Brooke’s ‘barrier thesis’—that the English kings sought to block papal interference in the kingdom—still largely holds sway. My PhD reconsiders this and seeks to rethink the prevailing model of conflict between church and state that frames Anglo-Papal relations.

My work assesses the ideals of this relationship and the extent to which ideals shaped the conduct of the relationship in practice. As in all human relations there were tensions. Equally, there appears to have been an understanding that much could be gained by compromise. The nature of royal, papal and episcopal jurisdictions forms a significant part of my research. Building on the excellent work of Martin Brett, the thesis demonstrates a lack of any clear distinction and a great deal of interdependence, with rights and authority shared and overlapping. Papal, royal and episcopal claims were often complementary as opposed to competing.

Sonali Dhanpal (Newcastle), RHS Marshall Fellow: October 2021-March 2022 ‘Contested Bangalore: Caste, Colonial, and Princely Politics’
My doctoral thesis destabilizes the notion of a monolithic colonial rule in India through a close spatial analysis of Bangalore. My chronology, which spans 1881 to 1920, is framed by two events: the return to power of the Mysore Maharaja, and the onset of the third plague pandemic that accelerated Bangalore’s large-scale suburbanisation. Research shows how, in a capital city divided between indirect princely and direct British rule, the production of urban space was a negotiated enterprise between two competing authorities and multiple local actors. My work therefore opens up new paths for the study of colonial urbanism in India, offering a first account of how this political arrangement materialized on the ground. If architectural historians have traditionally avoided the topic of race, they have asked even fewer questions about caste. My doctorate addresses this omission by focusing on Bangalore’s speculative land and housing market driven by rentier capitalism.

It expands on scholarship that shows how industrial capitalism not only drew on and was sustained by caste, but also replicated its existence in the built form. Land, the city’s main commodity of production, is the focus of my spatial enquiry—my two sites of investigation being residential layouts and housing.

The doctorate builds on recent histories of colonial urbanism which foreground the role of indigenous actors as co-producers of the built landscape, in India and elsewhere. I demonstrate how space and socio-spatial practices mediated these complex processes, drawing on sources with a variety of authorial voices: newspapers, missiological records, memoirs and postcards. These reveal how appropriation of Bangalore was a profoundly spatial contest. I map the city’s transformation—from British, to princely, and finally to national rule—and how this determines contemporary urban politics of Bangalore as capital of the Indian state of Karnataka.

Petros Spanou (Oxford), RHS Centenary Fellow: January-July 2022 ‘The Crimean Moment and Crucible: Just War, Principles of Peace and Debates in Victorian Wartime Thought and Culture, 1854-1856’

My doctoral research examines the complex ways in which the idea of just war and the principles of the British peace movement framed important yet hitherto overlooked religious, intellectual, political and cultural debates during the Crimean War (1854-6). It posits a new account for examining mid-Victorian ideas on conflict and peace, and advances fresh perspectives in the historiography of the Crimean War in particular, and of Victorian religious and intellectual culture more generally.

Where historians have previously studied the war intensively as an episode in diplomatic and military history, my thesis offers fresh perspectives on the war’s cultural impact and place in Victorian consciousness. On the one hand, it presents the war as an important historical moment: an epoch-defining event marking, in the eyes of most contemporaries, a historical caesura which ended the forty-year period of European peace since the Vienna settlement. On the other, my thesis presents the conflict as a crucible in
which mid-Victorian ideas on war and peace interacted. The outcome saw intense and eclectic debates over Britain's duties as a European power, and, most significantly, on the morality of war in general and its place in human life and history. My doctorate presents the first scholarly attempt to examine these debates systematically. It shows that while British servicemen were fighting in Eastern Europe, a vibrant and highly interactive 'war of words' was being played out on the home front between the peace movement (the London Peace Society, Quakers, and other peace-minded groups) and pro-war clerical and lay intellectuals and other commentators who, almost invariably, employed the idea and language of 'just war' to vindicate Britain's resort to arms.

My work builds a contextual account which offers a close, critical, and analytical reading of a range of underused or hitherto untapped sources. It draws on unpublished material from archives in Oxford, London and Manchester, as well as on printed primary sources such as sermons, religious and secular newspapers and periodicals, pamphlets and treatises, parliamentary speeches, war poetry and visual sources—including engravings, photographs and cartoons.

In my thesis I weave together two different historiographies on immobility and artisan capitalism. The main argument hinges on recontextualizing the urban political history of Muslims, mainly artisans (tailors) and cloth merchants, who stayed on in West Bengal after partition (1947-67), as resilient survivors rather than passive victims of ghettoisation and state control.

Without understating the realities of 'stuckness' and immobility—entrenched poverty, obligations of care-work, communal intimidation and everyday indignities—I demonstrate how some Muslim tailors thrived within these threatened and seemingly uninhabitable contexts. I examine their modes of resistance and negotiation through a cluster of five assets I describe as 'immobility capital': locational incentives and demand for made-to-measure clothing; hereditary skills and artisanship; patronage networks with cloth merchants and outfitters; use of small technologies, such as Singer sewing machines; and dependence on women's / household labour. Not all tailors possessed this full set of assets. For instance, someone with a skill did not necessarily have a patron, but adapted their talent in response to changing market demands for particular commodities. Together these Muslim artisanal communities were able to transform their assets into sufficient 'immobility capital' to stay on in independent India.

A major challenge when writing about Muslim tailors is their opacity in conventional archives. The sources we use also have a profound effect on the History that's written. Confronting the dearth of conventional archives on Muslim tailors, I've sought sources outside official records, and in doing so curated a small archive of my own. This includes oral history interviews with third and fifth-generation Muslim tailors and cloth merchants in Calcutta, photographs of tailors in their workshops, shop hoardings and vernacular tailoring manuals. All pulsate with stories about acquiring skills, sewing and staying on.
Late 2021 sees new work to record and conserve the papers of George W. Prothero, historian, editor and RHS President between 1901 and 1905. On its completion in early 2022, we’ll publish a new 200-page catalogue to a fascinating collection that’s central to the Society’s archive.

Over the page, you’ll find more on the current work to catalogue Prothero’s correspondence, manuscripts and working papers — from the 1860s to the early 1920s.

Prothero’s papers — along with the admission cards for thousands of Fellows, the correspondence of G.R. Elton, and over 100 years of RHS event records — offer a superb insight into the emergence of the modern historical profession, and those who’ve shaped the discipline from the late-nineteenth century onwards. Completion of the Prothero catalogue is, we hope, the first step towards a more accessible and widely-used RHS archive.
Readers of previous Newsletters will know of the Society’s work to create a new catalogue of the papers of George W. Prothero (1848-1922), President of the RHS between 1901 and 1905. The initial phase of this project ran between 2018 and 2019 but was then paused on account of office closures and lockdowns. By this point, the considerable work of Eilish Gregory and Imogen Evans had resulted in the cataloguing of 800 items, roughly two-thirds of Prothero’s papers as held by the Society.

It was a great delight that the cataloguing work finally resumed in October 2021—generously supported by the Marc Fitch Fund and now overseen by Zoë Karens, former archivist at the Institute of Historical Research. Over three months, Zoë will complete the catalogue for a collection that consists primarily of Prothero’s correspondence, notebooks, working papers and archival transcripts. On completion, the collection will run to over 20 storage boxes, and be accompanied by a new ISAD(G) compliant catalogue to replace the existing version written in the late 1960s. The new catalogue—available on the RHS website from January 2022—will also direct researchers to other holdings of Prothero papers elsewhere in the UK.

The principal series in the Society’s collection comprise personal and professional correspondence to Prothero. These cover his time as editor of the Quarterly Review and
President of the Royal Historical Society, and include letters from the publisher John Murray, historian Oscar Browning, and Conservative politician and prime minister, Arthur Balfour. These letters demonstrate Prothero’s commitment to promote History as a serious, professional discipline of wide-ranging civic value. Between 1914 and 1922, exchanges with European and North American correspondents also reveal Prothero’s interest in British foreign policy and his contribution to the Versailles conference and post-war settlement.

The current project is an exercise not just in cataloguing but also rediscovery. So far 10 bundles of Prothero’s papers, previously thought missing, have been identified and reintegrated into the collection. This work has the added benefit of bringing to our attention other forgotten papers in the Society’s collection, among them sets of annual event cards dating from Prothero’s Presidency onwards. It’s hoped further funding will be obtained for their digitisation, as well as for research on the Society’s extensive papers relating to early Fellows. More broadly, we hope the availability of a new Prothero catalogue in early 2022 brings the RHS archive to wider public attention, as an important statement on the development and membership of the historical profession in Britain and overseas.
Newly Elected Fellows

ELECTED NOVEMBER 2020

Robert Aldrich, BA, MA, PhD
Tarak Barkawi, PhD
Stephen Bernard, MA, MSt, DPhil, FHEA
Jessica Borge, PhD
Alex Brondarbit, BA, MA, PhD
Adam Burns, BA, PGCE, MSc (Res), MEd, PhD
Richard Butler, MA, MPhil, PhD
Tim Causer, BA, MLitt, PhD
Emily Cock, BA, PhD
Lisa Cody, PhD
Christian Cooijmans, BA, MSc, PhD
Liesbeth Corens, PhD
Rosemary Cresswell, BA, MSc, PhD, PGCAP, FHEA
Jeremiah Dancy, DPhil
John Davies, PhD, DAA
Alexandre Delin, PhD
Norman Doe, LLM, MTh, PhD, DCL, LLD, FLSW
Rémy Duthille, PhD
Sutapa Dutta, MA, MPhil, PhD
Bryce Evans, PhD
Hervin Fernandez-Aceves, BA, MA, PhD
Aidan Forth, PhD
Julie Gibbings, PhD
Jayne Gifford, PhD
James Goldrick, BA, MLitt, DLitt
Katrina Gulliver, PhD
Thomas Hanson, PhD
David Harry, PhD
Rick Herrera, PhD
Claire Hilton, MB, BS, BSc, MA, MD, PhD, MRCP, FRC-Psych
Frances Houghton, PhD
Benjamin Huskinson, BA, MSc, MLitt, MPhil, PhD
Simon Johnson, PhD
Steven King, BA, PhD
Paul Knight, PhD
Charlie Laderman, PhD
Caroline Laske, MA, LLM, PhD
Colin Lee, MA
Christian Leitmeir, MMus, DPhil
Elaine Leong, DPhil, Alexandra Makin, MSC, PhD, PGCE
Tristan Marshall, BA, MA, PhD
Jeremy Maxwell, BA, MA, PhD
Ciaran McCabe, BA, H. Dip., MA, PhD
Paul Mckechnie, MA, DPhil, PGCE
Guy Middleton, BA, MEd, MA, PhD
Matthew Mitchell, BA, MLitt, PhD
Nigel Mortimer, BA, MA, DPhil
Angela Muir, BA, MA, PhD
Jesse Norman, BA, MPhil, PhD
Mervyn O’Driscoll, BA, MA, PhD
Richard Oosterhoff, PhD
Harrison Perkins, MDiv, PhD
Laura Pfuntner, PhD
Andrew Roberts, PhD
David Robinson, BSc, PhD
Marie Ruiz, PhD
Matteo Salonia, PhD, FHEA
Ilaria Scaglia, PhD
Tripurdaman Singh, PhD
Victoria Solomonidis-Hunter, PhD
Julie Spraggan, BA, MA, PhD
Judy Stephenson, BA, MSc, PhD
ELECTED FEBRUARY 2021

Peter Aschenbrenner, JD
Gareth Atkins, BA, MPhil, PhD
Silvio Berardi, PhD
Andrew Boyd, BA, DPhil
Anthony Clark, PhD
Catherine Clarke, BA, MA, PhD
Richard Cockett, MA, PhD
Jennifer Crane, BA, MA, PhD
Jonathan Cummings, PhD
Caillan Davenport, BA, MPhil, DPhil
Fan Hong, PhD
Austin Fisher, BA, MA, PhD
David Geiringer, PhD
Gabor Gelleri, MA, PhD
Christopher Guyver, BA, MA, DPhil
Benjamin Jones, BA, MTeach, PhD
Matthew Kidd, PhD
Paul Lawrence, BA, MA, PhD
Lauren Mackay, BMus, MHist, PhD
David Manning, BA, MA, PhD
Stuart Mathieson, BA, MA, PhD
Bill McBride, PhD
Terence McSweeney, PhD
Ian Morley, BA, MA, PhD
Roy Paul, BA, BSc, MTS, ThD
Robert Peckham, BA, PhD
Christopher Phillips, BA, MA, PhD
Christopher Powell, BA, MA, PhD, LRAM, FRCO
Garth Pratten, BA, PhD
Charlie Rozier, BA, MA, PhD
Margaret Scull, BA, MA, PhD
Melanie Tebbutt, BA, MPhil, PhD
Jonas Van Tol, BA, MPhil, PhD
Yannick Veilleux-Lepage, BA, MA, PhD
Nicholas Westcott, BA, MA, PhD
Janet Weston, PhD
Iain Wilton, BA, PhD
Rebecca Wynter, BA, MPhil, PhD
Soile Yivuori, PhD

ELECTED MAY 2021

Nicholas Amor, MA, PhD
Julie Anderson, PhD
Geoff Andrew, BA, PhD
Catherine Arnold, BA
Karen Bartlett, MA
Alison Baxter, BA, MA, PhD, PGCE
Carol Beardmore, BA, MA, PhD
Adam Begley, BA, PhD
Sheila Blackburn, BA, PhD
Tracy Borman, PhD
Stuart Bradley, BEd, PhD
Tancred Bradshaw, MA, MSc, PhD
Emily Bridger, PhD
Ting Chang, PhD
Natalya Chernyshova, BA, MA, PhD
Jessica Cox, PhD
Eugene Coyle, BSc, DipEd
Malcolm Craig, PhD
Emily Cuming, PhD, FHEA
Matthew D’Auria, PhD
Luke Daly-Groves, BA, MA, PhD
Gillian Darley, BA, MSc
Saul David, MA, PhD
Albert Dockter, PhD
Patricia Fara, BA, MSc, PhD
Alison Fell, BA, MA, PhD
Austin Fisher, BA, MA, PhD
Tanya Fitzgerald, BA, MA, MEd, PhD
Judith Flanders, DPhil
Roy Flechner, DPhil, PhD
Peter Galloway, BA, PhD, DLitt, FSA
Erika Graham-Goering, BA, MA, PhD
Annie Gray, MA, MA, PhD
Georgina Green
Thomas Green, BA, MTh, PhD
Eilish Gregory, BA, MA, PhD
Onni Gust, PhD
Lawrence Hatter, BA, MA, PhD
Sean Heath, MA, MPhil, PhD
Matthew Hefferan, BA, MA, PhD
Stephen Hodkinson, BA, PhD
Tom Holland, MA
Catherine Holmes, MA, DPhil
Joseph Hone MA, MA, DPhil
Katja Hoyer, MA
Cathy Hunt, BA, PhD
Claire Jowitt, BA, MA, PhD
Josephine Kane, BA, MA, PhD
Matthew Kerry, BA, MA, PhD
Jagjeet Lally, PhD
Charles Lawrence, BSc, CEng, PhD
Alexander Lee, MA, MPhil, PhD
Andrew Lycett, BA, MA
Giles MacDonogh, BA, MA
Iain MacGregor, BA
Mathias Manon, MA, MSt, DPhil
Lynn McDowell Matthew, BA, PhD
Amanda McVitty, MA, PhD
Hilary Morris, PhD
Conor Morrissey, BA MA, PhD
John Moyle, BS, MB, MSc, PhD
Emilie Murphy, PhD
Julianne Nyhan, BA, PhD
Marius Ostrowski, DPhil
Richard Ovenden, BA, MA
Ilan Pappe, DPhil
Sami Pinarbasi, PhD
Christopher Powell, BA, MA, PhD
Janina Ramirez, BA, MA, PhD
Helen Rappaport, BA, DLitt
L. M. Ratnapalan, BA, MA, PhD
Jeremy Rich, PhD
Jane Ridley, MA, DPhil
Jane Robinson, MA
James Rodgers, BA, PhD
Rochelle Rowe, PhD
Tim Satterthwaite, BA, MA, PhD
Max Skjönsberg, BA, MA, PhD
Angel Smith, BA, PhD
Francis Spufford, BA
Paul Stock, BA, MSc, PhD
Trevor Stone, MA, MSc, PhD
Julie Strange, BA, MPhil, PhD
Zoe Strimpel, MA, MPhil, PhD
Liam Temple, BA, MRes, PhD
Mark Thompson, BA, PhD
Jacqui Turner, PhD, SFHEA
Maiken Umbach, MA, PhD
Patrick Wallis, DPhil
Sarah Ward Clavier, BA, MPhil, DPhil
Sethina Watson, BA, MSt, DPhil
Clive Webb, BA, MA, PhD
Julie Wheelwright, BA, MA, PhD
Sue Wilkes, BA
Sarah Wise, BA, MA
Christian Wolmar, BA
John Wood, BA, MA, PhD
Julian Woodford, BSc
Barbara Zanchetta, PhD

**ELECTED JULY 2021**

Robbie Aitken, PhD
Marc Alexander, MA, MPhil, PhD
Ian Armour, BA, MA, PhD
Christopher Ash, BSc
Emma Aston, BA, MPhil, PhD
Revel Barker
Alison Beach, PhD
Hugh Beattie, PhD
Brad Beaven, BA, MA, PhD
Stephen Bennett, BA, MA, PhD
Egemen Bezci, PhD
Thomas Bishop, PhD
Thomas Breimaier, BA, MA, PhD
Thomas Brodie, BA, MSt, DPhil
Ugo Bruschi, PhD
Nathan Cardon, PhD
Claire Chatterton, BA, MA, PhD
David Churchill, BA, MA, PhD
Roland Clark, PhD
Paul Corner, BA, DPhil
Tony Craig, PhD
Nicholas Crane, BA
Alice Crossley, PhD
Jessica Dalton, BA, MA, PhD
Christina de Bellaigue, PhD
Joanna de Groot, BA, DPhil
Caroline Derry, MA, LLM, PhD
Malcom Dick, BA, PGCE, PhD
Steven Dieter, BA, BEd, MA
Matthew Dimmock, BA, MA, PhD
Celia Donert, BA, MA, PhD
Dennis Duncan, PhD
Dee Dyas, BA, MA, PhD
Serena Dyer, BA, MA, PhD
Hormoz Ebrahimnejad, PhD
Derek Elliott, PhD
Laura Evans, BA, MA, PhD
Michael Fass, BA, MA, MTh, DMin
Ilaria Favretto, PhD
Catherine Ferguson, MA, PhD
Mark Finney, BA, PhD
Robert Fletcher, BA, MA, MSt, DPhil
Chris Fuller, BA, MRes, PhD
David Gange, PhD
Sebastian Gehrig, DPhil
Chris Godden, BA, MA, PhD
David Greenwood, PhD
Hannah Greig, BA, MA, PhD
Sarah Gristwood, BA, MA
Jérôme Grosclaude, PhD
Armin Gruenbacher, MA, PhD
Anna Hájková, PhD
Maria Hayward, BA, MA, PhD
Matthew Heaslip, PhD
William Hern, MSc
Beatrice Heuser, BA, MA, DPhil
Steve Hewitt, PhD
Tracey Hill, BA, MA, PhD
Julia Hillner, PhD
Wendy Holden, NCTJ Dip.
Ian Horwood, BA, MA, PhD
Jon Howlett, PhD
Katja Hoyer, MA
David R M Irving, BMus, MPhil, PhD
Dan Jones, MA
Laura Kalas, PhD
Angus Konstam, MA, MA, MLitt
Giada Lagana, BA, MA, PhD
Craig Lambert, BA, MA, PhD
Sabine Lee, MPhil, PhD
Ulrich Lehner, DTh, DPhil
Alan Lester, BA, MA, PhD
James Lockhart, PhD
José Antonio López Sabatel, PhD
Gary Love, BA, MA, PhD
Mathew Lyons, BA, MA
Shivan Mahendrarajah, PhD
Jatinder Mann, PhD
Giuseppe Marcocci, PhD
Naomi Matsumoto, BA, MMus, PhD
Alexander Medcalf, BA, MA, PhD
Tommaso Milani, PhD
Sarah Miller-Davenport, PhD
Thomas Mills, BA, MA, PhD
Giles Milton, BA
Saurabh Mishra, PhD
Katharine Mitchell, BA, MA, PhD
Shaul Mitelpunkt, PhD
Simon Moody, BA, MA, PhD
Neville Morley, MA, PhD
Aislinn Muller, PhD
John Munro, PhD
Neil Murphy, PhD
Patricia Murrieta-Flores, BA, MSc, PhD
Dave Musgrove, BA, PhD
Kathleen Neal, BA, MSt, PhD, PhD
Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid, BA, MA, PhD
Rafaelle Nicholson, BA, MSt, PhD
Philip Norrie, MBBS, MA, MSc, MSoCSc PhD, MD
Shane O’Rourke, DPhil
Ed Owens, BA, MA, PhD
Ian Patel, PhD
Naomi Paxton, BA, MDra, PhD
Andy Pearce, BA, MA, PhD
Andrew Popp, BA, MA, PhD
Linda Porter, BA, DPhil
William Purkis, BA, MA, PhD
Alex Renton, BA
Carol Richardson, MA, PhD, FHEA
Klaus Richter, DPhil
Daniel Robinson, MA, MPhil, PhD
Katharina Rowold, BA, PhD
Dominic Sandbrook, MA, MLitt, PhD
Samita Sen, PhD
Hugo Service, BA, MPhil, PhD
Stephanie Seul, MPhil, PhD
Shalini Sharma, PhD
John Singleton, BA, BD, MSc, PhD
Asaf Siniver, PhD
Clare Siviter-Groschwald, BA, PhD
Matthew Smith, PhD
Keith Somerville, BSc
Beth Spacey, BA, MA, PhD
David Stack, PhD
Matthew Stibbe, BA, MA, DPhil
Nicola Tallis, PhD
Michael Taylor, BA MPhil, PhD
Frank Uekötter, DPhil
Ted Vallance, MA, DPhil
Wilko Graf Van Hardenberg, PhD
David Veevers, BA, MA, PhD
Lena Wahlgren-Smith, PhD
Kevin Waite, BA, MA, MPhil, PhD
Fionnuala Walsh, BA, PhD
Tosh Warwick, BA, MA, PhD
Thomas Waters, BA, MSt, DPhil
Peter Webster, PhD
David Weekes, BA, MTh, PhD
Sam Wetherell, PhD
Emma Wilby, BA, MA
Stephen Wilkinson, PhD
Helen Williams, BA, MA, PhD
Kate Williams, MA, MA, MA, DPhil
Zbigniew Wojnowski, PhD
Alexander Wragge-Morley, PhD
Simon Yarrow, DPhil
Henry Yeomans, BA, MA, MSc, PhD

ELECTED SEPTEMBER 2021

David Abrutat, BSc, MSc, PhD
Thomas Tunstall Alcocock, FHEA, BA, MA, PhD
Ali Ansari, PhD
Jackson Armstrong, BA, MPhil, PhD
Priya Atwal, PhD
Michael Bachmann, PhD
David Ballantyne, MA, MPhil, PhD
Milinda Banerjee, PhD
Eleanor Barraclough, MA, MPhil, PhD
Duncan Barrett, MA
Victoria Bates, BA, MA, PhD
Claire Battershill, BA, PhD
Svenja Bethke, MA, PhD
Mark Bryant, BA, PhD
Hannah Burrows, BA, MA, PhD
Clarinda Calma, PhD
Richard Carr, BA, MPhil, PhD
Denis Casey, BA, MA, PhD
Baris Messina Cayli, PhD
Margaret Connolly, MA, PhD
Raphael Cormack, PhD
Arunima Datta, PhD
Jonathan Davis, BA, MSoCSc, PhD
Max Deeg, PhD
Emlyn Dodd, PhD
Keith Down, BA, MA
Alison Downham Moore, PhD
Marianna Dudley, BA, MA, PhD
Michael Dwyer, BA, PhD
Nicholas Evans, BA, PhD
Catherine Feely, BA, MA, PhD
Jonathan Fennell, BA, MA, PhD
Laura Fernández-González, BA, MA, PhD
Mary Flannery, BA, MPhil, PhD
Kazuki Fujiyama, PhD
Michael J. Geary, BA, MRes, MLitt, PhD
Ewan Gibbs, MSc, MA, PhD

November 2021
Mike Gibson, MB, ChB, MPhil, PhD, FRCP
Oliver Godsmark, BA, MA, PhD
Matt Graham, BA, MA, PhD
Brett Greatley-Hirsch, BA, PhD
Philippa Gregory, CBE, PhD
Mark Hailwood, PhD
Erika Hanna, PhD
James Harland, BA, MA, PhD
James Hegarty, BA, MA, PhD
Alison Hems, BA, PhD
Rachel Herrmann, PhD
Michael Hope, BA, PhD
Richard Hornsey, BA, MA, PhD
Jessica Hower, BA, MA, PhD
Thomas Hunt, PhD
Kristin Hussey, MA, PhD
Michael Innes, BA, MA, PhD
Robert James, PhD
Greg Jenner, BA, MA
Richard Jones, BA, PhD
Spencer Jones, BA, MPhil, PhD
Hilary Kalmbach, AB, MSt, PhD
Kate Kennedy, PhD
Jasmin Kilburn-Toppin, PhD
Andy King, BA, MA, PhD
Claas Kirchhelle, PhD
Verena Krebs, PhD
Thomas Leahy, BA, MRes, PhD
Alexandra Lee, BA, MA, PhD
Alison Light, MA, MA, PhD
Keith Lowe, MA
Gaby Mahlberg, MA, PhD
Javed Majeed, MA, PhD
Sam Manning, BA, MA, PhD
Alberto Mingardi, PhD
Alex Mullen, MA, MPhil, PhD
Jacqueline Murray, BA, MA, PhD
Ulrike Müßig, PhD
Mark Nesbitt, BSc, MSc, PhD
Yewande Okuleye, PhD
Vincent O'Malley, BA, PhD
Corinne Painter, PhD
Kiri Paramore, PhD
Kevin Passmore, PhD
Giovanni Patriarca, PhD
Tetyana Pavlush, PhD
Nicholas Perry, BA
Giada Pizzoni, PhD
Eyal Poleg, BA, MA, PhD
William Pooley, BA, MA, MSt, PhD
David Price, BA, LLM, JD
Paul Rabbitts, BA
Jennifer Redmond, BA, MPhil, PhD
Charles V. Reed, PhD
Bess Rhodes, MA, MLitt, PhD
Nicole Ribianszky, BA, MA, MA, PhD
Rachel Rich, PhD
Jacqueline Riding, BA, MA, PhD
Katharina Rietzler, PhD
Daniel Salisbury, BA, MA, PhD
Mark A. Sammut Sassi, LLD, MJur, MA, LLM
Vikram Sampath, ME, MA, PhD
Heike Sampath, MA, MPhil, PhD
Robert Schmidt, MA, DPhil
Robert Skinner, BA, MA, PhD
Edmond Smith, PhD
John Spencer, BA, MA, PhD
Linda Sturtz, PhD
Warren Swain, BA, MA, BCL, DPhil
Danae Tankard, BA, MA, PhD
Melissa Terras, MA, MSc, PhD, CLTHE
Marie-Cécile Thoral, PhD
Michael Ticheler, BA, MA, PhD
Giles Udy, MBA
Esther van Raamsdonk, BA, MA, PhD
Oisín Wall, BA, MRes, PhD
Maurice Walsh, MRes, PhD
Wendy Webster, BA, MA, PhD
Jia Wei, PhD
Katherine Weikert, BA, MA, PhD
Hannah Whittaker, PhD
Manuela Williams, MA, PhD
Clifford Williamson, BA, PhD
David Wilson, BA, MSc, PhD
Rachel Winchcombe, PhD
Wanda Wyporska, BA, MSt, PhD
Lidia Luisa Zanetti Domingues, BA, MSt, PhD
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

ENCOURAGES, facilitates, and supports work towards greater equality, inclusion and representation in historical practice, research, and teaching