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1. Practical information

**Workshop venue:** The Institute of Materials, Minerals and Mining, 297 Euston Road.


**Directions:** [http://www.iom3.org/sites/default/files/London%20Location%20map%202017_0.pdf](http://www.iom3.org/sites/default/files/London%20Location%20map%202017_0.pdf)

**Dinner location:** Tas Restaurant, 22 Bloomsbury Street [http://www.tasrestaurants.co.uk/](http://www.tasrestaurants.co.uk/)

**Key contact:** Marijn Molema, tel: 0031 6 17453663
2. Workshop programme

Day 1 – Ideas & methodologies

13:00  Keynote address: John Tomaney: Interdisciplinary connections between history and regional studies: an introduction

13:45  Plenary speakers triangle

- James Hopkins (Manchester): History of and within the Regional Studies Association
- Michael Hebbert (UCL): Historian, Futurologist, Regional Planner: learning from Peter Hall 1932-2014
- Daniela Carl (RSA): Regional Studies Association nowadays

15.00  Break

15.25  Panel 1: Theoretical explorations

- Emil Evenhuis (Cambridge) & Andy Pike (Newcastle): Evolutionary economic geography meets comparative historical analysis: developing a comparative case study methodology to research the adaptive resilience of cities
- Robert Huggins (Cardiff) & Piers Thompson (Nottingham): Behavioural Geography and Regional Economic History: Agency, Culture and Psychology

16.30  Break

17.00  Keynote address: Natasha Vall: The concept of the region in history

17.45  Panel 2: Conceptual developments

- Stefania Fiorentino (UCL): From industrial districts to new types of clusters: Path dependencies in Italian small innovative businesses
- Tomàs Fernández-de-Sevilla (Brussel) & Joao Armando dalla Costa (Paraná, Brazil): The formation and growth of the Sao Paulo auto-industry cluster

c. 18.45  Out for dinner
Day 2 – Methodologies & case studies

08.30 Coffee

08.45 Keynote Address: Juan Rosés (LSE London): Measuring long term regional development

09.30 Panel 3: Variations in Measurement
  - Anna Missiaia & Kerstin Enflo (Lund): The historical roots of regional divergence: regional GDP in Sweden, 1570-1850
  - Justyna Kościńska (Warsaw): Persistent effects of historical partitions on educational achievements. Interdisciplinary approach
  - Katharine Timpson (Uni West-Scotland): Comparative account of regional policies in UK based on mortality rates, 1945-1980

10.50 Break

11.20 Panel 4: Regional Policies
  - Fabio Lavista (Varese, Italy): Structural policies, regional development and industrial specialisation. The Italian case (1952-2002)
  - Bart Hoogeboom (Leeuwarden, the Netherlands): Changing regional policies: the Netherlands in comparative perspective (1975 onwards)

12.40 Reflections and Prospections
Short statements by John Tomaney (UCL); Arno van der Zwet (Uni of West Scotland); Marijn Molema (Leeuwarden)

c. 13.15 End
3. Extended abstracts

Evolutionary economic geography meets comparative historical analysis: Developing a comparative case study methodology to research the adaptive resilience of cities
Emil Evenhuis – Cambridge University & Andy Pike – University of Newcastle

We want to outline the methodological considerations with regard to conducting comparative case studies to research the role of institutions and policy in the resilience / adaptability of cities since the early 1970s (i.e. their capacity to deal with economic change over time). These methodological considerations are based on two recent studies we are involved in: ‘The Political Economy of Adaptation and Resilience in Old Industrial Regions: A Comparative Study of South Saarland and Teesside’ (see https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/dspace/handle/10443/3285) and the ESRC-funded project ‘Structural Transformation, Adaptability and City Economic Evolutions’ (see www.cityevolutions.org.uk). In developing the methodology for these studies, we sought to expand the repertoire of research methods used within the burgeoning field of Evolutionary Economic Geography (e.g. Boschma and Martin, 2010), which so far – in terms of empirical research - has been dominated by quantitative approaches. We have drawn explicit inspiration from some of the precepts of Comparative Historical Analysis, and especially Comparative Institutional Analysis (which are, as yet, mainly prevalent in Political Science, Sociology, and Development Economics; and have found very limited application in (Economic) Geography).

Behind our methodological considerations are a set of ontological and epistemological commitments, which are – in broad terms – based on Critical Realism. Accordingly the focus is on trying to identify the ‘mechanisms’ through which cities adapt to change, and the contextual conditions in which these operate (while furthermore being specific about levels of scale, and the interactions between scales). Because the focus is especially on institutions and policy, we need to examine on the one hand the mechanisms through which institutions and policies evolve over time, and on other hand, the impact institutions and policies may have on other key mechanisms within a city economy.

This then leads us to consider two types of methodological issues. First, issues that concern the comparison and selection of cases. Drawing on notions from Comparative Historical / Institutional Analysis – such as the typologies developed by McMichael (1990) and Tilly (1984), we have reflected on the types of comparison, and the relationship between comparative case study research and theory development. Following on from this, we considered various research designs and the specification of variables that should determine the selection of cases. The main designs to be considered are either ‘most-similar’ cases in which cases are similar in most aspects except for the institutions and policies implemented (can this then explain any differences in performance?). Or alternatively, a design based on ‘diverse cases’, in which cities have varied in their performance (the focus is then on whether this variation is because of differences in institutions and policies, or other factors). In ‘The Political Economy of Adaptation and Resilience in Old Industrial Regions: A Comparative Study of South Saarland and Teesside’ we have used the former design, while in ‘Structural Transformation, Adaptability and City Economic Evolutions’ we use the latter.

The main focus of presentation however will be on a second set of issues, which refer to a number of analytical frameworks and research techniques for cross-case comparison and within-case analysis. The analytical frameworks represent a more holistic approach to assessing institutions and policies, which does not consider institutions and policies individually, but rather looks at whole sets of institutional
arrangements and programmes of policies. These frameworks then support the analysis of the evolution of institutions and of policies over time. But in addition, they facilitate in creating plausible accounts regarding the impact of institutions and policies on the adaptive resilience of city economies, by juxtaposing key strengths and key focal points in institutions and policies, with a careful analysis of the processes in various domains of the city economy over time. The most important technique used here is 'process tracing'; and again we have drawn particular inspiration from the way this technique has been applied and has been developed in Comparative Historical / Institutional Analysis (e.g. Bennett and Checkel, 2015).
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Behavioral Geography and Regional Economic History: Agency, Culture and Psychology

Robert Huggins - Cardiff University & Piers Thompson - Nottingham Trent University

Emerging approaches in economic geography, especially those adopting evolutionary perspectives, recognise the value of understanding regional economic histories as a means of understanding long-term patterns of uneven development across places. Based on concepts such as economic path-dependency and lock-in, these approaches have suggested that contemporary economic geographies can be traced to the historical industrial structure of regions. These approaches, therefore, have provided invaluable insights into the co-evolution of industries, firms and the interaction between firms, as means of determining the causes of uneven development.

In essence, however, theories relating to the spatial unevenness of development – especially across cities and territorial regions - are largely rooted in explanations based on the location, agglomeration and organisation of firms, industries and capital. Indeed, most of these theories have been relatively quiet with regard to the role of human behaviour in shaping regional economic trajectories. As a result, one strand of contemporary economic geography theory is moving toward a (re)turn to addressing the role of individual and collective behaviour in determining urban and regional development outcomes and the inequality they breed. The growing recognition given to cultural values has led to the emergence of a ‘new sociology of development’ that entwines the role of geography with factors relating to human behaviour.

Similarly, recent work on the spatial nature of personality psychology has sought to address knowledge gaps relating to the role of context and environment in shaping behaviour. Scholars have begun to highlight the role of agency and institutions of the political economy in fostering uneven development and inequality, particularly though the welfare effects generated within and through communities.

Given the above, this paper focuses on three key interrelated concepts: culture; personality psychology and agency. Drawing on a critique of a range of literature as well empirical data, the paper seeks to establish new explanations of how behavioural factors are reproduced, change and co-evolve with the historical industrial structure of regions. In particular, through the prevailing forms of culture, personality psychology and agency, cities and regions themselves produce a spatially bounded rationality.

Spatially bounded rationality determines the forms and types of human agency apparent in a given city or region, and subsequently the nature of development. The paper argues that psychocultural behavioural patterns provide a basis for understanding the type and nature of human agency that exists within cities and regions. Such agency is likely to be one of the key rooted drivers associated with more traditional explanatory causes of spatial unevenness and inequality. This paper, therefore, seeks to go some way to developing a research agenda for capturing the role of key agents at
particular points in time in the history of regions. It is argued that such insights offer an enriched understanding of the connection between the contemporary and historical performance, nature and standing of cities and regions.
Italian SMEs and innovation: old and new types of manufacturing compared: a complex history of untraded relations.

Stefania Fiorentino – University College London

New types of productive clusters are emerging in some the main Italian cities like Milan, Turin and Rome. The Italian regional institutions are nowadays supporting the birth of a new entrepreneurial culture and of a system of locally embedded creative and digital start-ups. Mainly under the influence of some EU regulations, Italy have seen the emergence of some regional place-based policies allocating funding to relocate the economy of the corresponding regions - such as Lazio or Lombardia – towards some technology oriented and knowledge intensive activities. On a first look this might seem a breaking point in the Italian tradition of regional policies - especially in regions such as Lombardia, where the design and manufacturing industry is still strong - instead some similarities with the historical features of the Italian regional strategies can still be recognized.

This push towards new types of entrepreneurialism should be read with both the socio-economic struggles occurred after the general downturn and the changes imposed by globalization and new information technologies to the traditional small scale manufacturing model of Italy: the industrial district. In terms of regional policies, Italy is historically well-known as a key reference in the agglomeration theory for its Marshallian industrial districts (Becattini 2002; Marshall 1920). This model became during the 1980s the landmark of the Italian “made in Italy” and its quality; as such it was mainly celebrated for its flexible specialization (Piore and Sabel 1984) and its institutional embeddedness (Granovetter 1985). As a synonym of innovation in the productive chain of SMEs it has triggered in literature waves of New Regionalism (Storper 1995), lately converged in the well known cluster theory by Porter (1998), which has been applied in many policy framework to regenerate different urban areas.

While the traditional industrial districts’ milieus were losing competitiveness and their innovative features, new types of businesses, crafts and digital fabrications have emerged in most of the main Italian cities. Those new types of manufacturing and applied services are linked on one side to the dissemination of the Maker Movement and to the development of shared service accommodations but on the other side, they relies on venture capitalists and institutional led start-ups incubators.

The current paper aims to analyse the institutional role in this current mix of top-down and bottom-up strategies, regulating the new innovation trends in Italy. A comparison is built with the historical features of the Italian industrial districts.
The investigation will draw upon an analysis of the current regional policy framework in place in Italy and in particular in the Lazio region as well as on 30 interviews led among the main institutional actors promoting this new soft-tech cluster of manufacturing in Rome. The assessment of the ecosystem of innovation in the Italian capital city and more in general that of the current Italian regional trends will shed light on continuities and discontinuities with the Italy of the industrial districts. The findings so far show that despite the geographical and industrial differences, a path dependency can still be observed in the Italian regional strategies from both periods. This has been identified in the system of untraded relations established between the firms and the institutional entanglement as revealed especially by the system of snowball sampling applied while leading interviews in Rome.
The formation and growth of the São Paulo auto-industry cluster

Tomás Fernández-de-Sevilla - Free University of Brussels & Armando João Dalla Costa – Federal University of Paraná

The regional concentration of industry has been pointed as a source of competitive advantage in both developed and developing countries (Porter, 1990; Schmitz, 1999). The aim of this research is to analyse the formation and growth of the São Paulo automobile industry cluster until its expansion was completed at mid-1970s. The region considered encompasses companies and institutions located in São Paulo city, in its ABC (the neighbouring municipalities of Santo André, São Bernardo, and São Caetano) and the municipality of São José dos Campos (85 km from São Paulo).

The competitive advantages associated with the geographic concentration of industry were first characterised in Marshall (1890). The Marshallian district was revisited by Italian economic geographers who pointed out that the competitive advantage of industrial districts of the so-called ‘Third Italy’ came from an institutional environment that was characterised by an abundance of small and medium-sized firms with a high level of flexibility, permitting cooperation between firms and local governments to share risks and stabilise markets (Brusco, 1982). The Italian perspective has been challenged in Markusen (1996) by presenting three typologies of industrial districts articulated around large companies, which would better explain the flourishing and consolidation of regional economies. Hub-and-spoke districts, the most predominant typology, is formed by a few large companies that act as anchors or hubs to the regional economy. From business history, Chandler (1990) and, today, Lazonick (2016), have also defended the greater efficiency of large companies, emphasising that their success lies in their accumulated organizational capabilities. Cluster firms could also obtain part of their competitive advantage from their access to public or semi-public goods, such as infrastructures, vocational schools, universities, and research centres, which used to be articulated by trade associations (Porter, 1998). By using an historical analysis from a political economy perspective, Chang (2002) has recovered the protectionist argument for the defence of emerging industries to argue that all economies in the process of modernisation have employed industrial, trade, and technological policies to boost their economic development. The insistence on the need for developing countries to adopt active industrial policies is shared extensively (Amsden 2001; Stiglitz and Lin, 2013). This paper attempts to assess the role played by external economies, hub companies, cluster institutions, and active industrial policy in the formation and growth of the automotive industry clustered in São Paulo.

The wealth from coffee exportation facilitated the emergence of São Paulo’s industry in the early twentieth century. The number of industrial establishments in the overall state went from 327 in 1907 to 9,603 in 1928 (which employed over 150,000 workers), raising the weight of São Paulo’s industry’s share of Brazil’s total from 16 to 37 percent (Negri, 1996: 36–7). The origins of the São Paulo auto-industry cluster can be found in the dozens of small workshops serving the spare parts market that progressively emerged during the 1920s since the number of cars registered in São Paulo state reached 70,000 vehicles in 1929. Ford (1921), GM (1925), and International Harvester (1926) established facilities to assemble
vehicles from imported CKD kits. Their activity was facilitated by the good connection –by railroad (1870s) and by highway (1910s)– between the Port of Santos and the city of São Paulo. Region’s capabilities were also reinforced with the schools of mechanics established by Ford and GM.

Ford’s unsuccessful attempts to establish more assembly lines in other Brazilian regions –Recife (1925), Porto Alegre (1926), and Rio de Janeiro (1927)– could indicate the presence of Marshallian external economies in São Paulo. This hypothesis could be reinforced by the fact that GM also established their subsidiary in São Paulo after an indepth feasibility study conducted by the Corporation’s management that placed special value on the availability of electric power, raw materials, accessories, and spare components. Even though early knowledge of the art was widespread throughout the region in form of 317 establishments dedicated to the manufacture of transport material which employed almost 5,000 people (Negri, 1996: 36-7), the critical mass necessary for the cluster’s existence was still far off. Mainly, because Ford and GM restricted their operation to the simple assembly of imported CKD kits.

The Great Depression placed the Brazilian economy in dire straits. São Paulo’s recovery began in 1933, boosted by industrial expansion driven mainly by national capital that erected small and medium-sized plants with low capital intensity. However, the cluster’s opportunity to achieve a critical mass came with the trade restrictions brought about by the WW2, which favoured the flourishing of workshops that could provide a wide range of parts and components, even though they were undercapitalised and undersized. As they became aware of their common interests, they joined together to push for maintaining barriers to foreign competitors once the war was over. The association of autoparts-makers created in São Paulo in April 1952 had its first success a few months later when 104 groups of parts and accessories were protected by the Getúlio Vargas’s new government (established after democratic election on 1951). The import of complete vehicles was banned shortly after, with only the entry of CKD kits without the aforementioned groups of parts being permitted. Forced by the new legislation, Volkswagen, Mercedes-Benz, and Willys-Overland also established assembly lines in São Paulo. Although a hundred of firms were in the region, the lack of large carmakers with great demand-pull capacity was the main constraint to the cluster’s expansion. As occurred with Ford and GM, the new comers were far from being fully fledged manufacturing facilities. Moreover, after Vargas’s suicide two months later, the new liberal government of João Café Filho (1954-55) revoked the protectionist measures.

The cluster’s expansion took place once Juscelino Kubitschek’s government (1956-61) applied a broad set of active industrial policies based on protection and high levels of domestic content (90-95 percent). The governmental guidelines incentivised the development of the subsidiaries already established. Ford and GM were forced to develop their facilities and become mass producers, while Volkswagen (São Bernardo), Mercedes (São Bernardo) and Willys (São José) build up new and modern factories. The large carmakers gradually organised the cluster hierarchically as the 1960s progressed, transferring part of the organisational capabilities that they had been developing for years and that were at the heart of their competitive advantage. To achieve the level of local content committed to, the final manufacturers were forced to teach the car parts industry concepts from industrial organisation, to give them equipment and tools, and to facilitate contact with their foreign suppliers, helping them obtain the transfer of licenses and
technical assistance. As this process expanded, the São Paulo cluster gradually adopted a similar form to what Markusen (1996) characterised as hub-and-spoke district. In the 1960s, the cluster’s industry union continued to play a central role in the development of the autoparts industry, focusing on obtaining quality standards and on training workers. In 1974, carmakers directly generated almost 70,000 jobs, while the ancillary industry generated almost 200,000 jobs.

Although in the first half of the twentieth century São Paulo was the most industrialised region in Brazil—a backward and agriculture-based country—, by the middle of the century car production was almost token. Twenty-five years later, São Paulo had placed Brazil among the top ten car-producing countries in the world. Different leading brands in the industry accepted transferring their knowledge and technologies, forced by a closed market situation and by strict local content requirements. As a result, the cluster evolved towards a hierarchical organisational structure headed by large final manufacturers under foreign control, while the weight of Brazilian capital, even in the autoparts industry, gradually reduced. This research shows how a certain region in a backward country was able to develop one of the flagship industries of the Second Industrial Revolution, proving the potential of infant industry policy. However, the research also highlights how active policy only impacted on the most industrialised region of the country. A pool of specialised suppliers and skilled workers, together with vibrant industry associations and an appropriate provision of public goods, increased the region’s competitive advantage.
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The historical roots of divergence: regional GDP in Sweden, 1570-2010

Kerstin Enflo & Anna Missiaia - Lund University

The extent and causes of regional inequality in the process of economic growth are at the core of historical economic research. Scholars have devoted much attention to the role of industrialization in driving regional inequalities. In a pioneering article, Williamson (1965) proposed the view that industrialisation led to increasing regional inequality. The evidence was collected for several countries, but covered only a relatively short time period in the middle the 20th century. With this dataset, Williamson found a peak in regional inequality in many countries, occurring sometime in the interwar period, and he attributed it to industrialisation. Since then, economic historians have extended the evidence calculating regional GDPs for longer time periods. Through the use of new data, it has become more and more clear that regional inequality and large differences in the level of GDP already existed well before industrialization. For instance, recent estimates of regional GDP for Sweden from 1860 to 2010 show that inequality was high already at the outset of the Industrial Revolution (Enflo et al., 2010). The same is true for other large European countries such as Italy (Felice, 2011) or Spain (Roses et al., 2010). However, due to lack of data, it has been deemed virtually impossible to extend most regional GDP series further back than mid-19th century (see the forthcoming book by Rosés and Wolf with European data that starts around 1900 for most counties). Since the industrial take-off arguably occurred in the 19th century in most cases, the existing evidence tells us very little about how regional inequalities came about and how they evolved as industrialization unfolded.

Thus, we still lack information on regional inequality in the pre-industrial period. This paper aims to address this issue for the first time by presenting a dataset of regional GDPs in a preindustrial European economy that covers the entire period from 1750-1850. By connecting our series to the existing ones by Enflo et al. (2014) for the period 1860-2000, we are able to produce the longest set of regional GDP series to date for any single country. We also provide a benchmark for 1571 using a different methodology.

Following Geary and Stark (2002), we use information on employment figures for five broad sectors (agriculture, manufacturing, private services and public service) from Tabellverket to allocate national value added figures from Schön and Krantz (2015) to the regions (with the only exception of mining for which we have information on mining production). We use wages from Jörberg (1972), Söderberg (2010) and Gary (forthcoming) to correct for productivity differentials. Our results are summarized in a database on regional GDP per worker and sectoral labor force in Sweden’s 24 counties (roughly corresponding to NUTSlevel 3) for 10-year benchmarks between 1750 and 1850. For 1571 we use tax information collected by Andersson Palmt (2013) using records on a one-time tax collected by the Swedish king after a 6-year war with Danmark (the so called Älvsborgs ransom, which covered a tenth of all cattle, agricultural surplus and metal goods owned by Swedish citizens).

Our paper speaks to the literature about the geographical roots of the Industrial Revolution. While it is possible to hypothesize that regions exhibiting pre-industrial dynamism might also become successful
industrializers, others have stressed that the Industrial Revolution was a radically different in its potential to benefit areas that were previously backward. There is a long tradition of explaining the Industrial Revolution in terms of national events, but lately scholars have started to pay attention to its regional roots (for example Kelly, Morgan and Mokyr, 2015). Similarly, economic geographers have paid substantial attention to the issue of path dependency in constructing long-run evolutionary approaches to regional development (Martin and Sunley, 2016). By constructing long enough regional GDP series to provide 100 years of evidence for the pre-industrial period, we are be in a better position to scrutinize claims about long-run regional path dependency and whether pre-industrial regional growth was decisive in determining the early location of the Industrial Revolution. Thus, our dataset opens the door to a very long run analysis that has so far only been performed on national series or between individuals.

Using coefficients of variation obtained after connecting our pre-industrial data to the existing regional GDP figures we show that regional inequality was low in 1571, high in 1750, well before industrialization, and declined thereafter, quite contrary to the inverted U-shape hypothesis defined by Williamson (1965). How can we explain the large inequalities in regional GDP per capita in the pre-industrial period? We argue that three factors are important. Firstly, regional agricultural wages suggest that there were large productivity differentials in agriculture. Institutional barriers to internal migration (for example internal passports and parish-based poor relief) meant that labor markets were far from integrated, thus productivity differentials could be sustained. Secondly, mining was an important part of industry and export revenues. Wage differentials in the mining sector suggest that the skill premium in the industry was high. However, mining was concentrated to specific parts of the country, influencing regional inequalities in industry. Finally, the mercantilist policy of concentrating foreign trading rights and favor manufactories in Stockholm put the capital region in an extraordinary position. During the 18th century about 40 percent (about 600 ships) of Sweden’s merchant fleet were based in Stockholm. In addition, more than 60 percent of Sweden’s manufacturing workers were in Stockholm in 1750 (Söderberg et al 1984, table 1). Thus, sectors with relatively high value added per worker were disproportionately based in the capital region.

This paper shows that regional inequality was low in the 16th century but was large and persistent already 100 years before Sweden’s take-off into modern economic growth. By providing the first set of regional GDPs per county we shed light on several issues concerning long-run regional growth and inequality. Firstly, although Sweden was pre-dominantly agricultural, large productivity differentials existed between the counties. Secondly, there was substantial dynamism in the industrial sector, even before industrialization. However, industry was confined to either the mining district or the protected manufactories that were placed mainly in the urban areas, especially in Stockholm. As industry generated a substantial share of national value added, the regional concentration of early industry drove inequality, even before we can speak of any large-scale take off into modern economic growth and industrialization. Finally, the capital city of Stockholm was extremely favored by mercantilist laws, indicating a concentration of service and industry to the capital and potentially also that extractors of surplus were
disproportionally located in the area. As some of the mercantilist restrictions were gradually removed, Stockholm’s county stagnated between 1750 and 1850.

This paper speaks not only to the literature about long-run regional inequalities, it also suggests the lack of a clear regional connection between productive areas before industrialization and the regions that were taking off into modern economic growth in the mid-19th century up to today. As such, the paper questions that long-run path dependence carried over from the pre-industrial period to industrialization, or the pre-industrial growth was decisive in explaining where modern economic growth was taking place. Looking at Kelly et al. (2015) the underlying causes of industrial location between Britain and Sweden seem to be very different, especially in the role of wages. In spite of this, we share with them the view that there was little path dependency between the location of the Industrial Revolution and that of later stages of modern economic growth.

Finally, the availability of regional GDP series allows us to provide a methodological contribution to the literature. For the first time we can observe the relationship between urbanization and economic growth at regional level before industrialization. In a recent article, Jedwab and Vollrath (2015) show that there is indeed a changing relationship between urbanisation and growth over the long run, suggesting that the phenomenon of urbanisation without growth can be traced back to well before the Industrial Revolution. From a methodological point of view, the correct identification of the relationship is paramount as a number of scholars have used urbanisation rates as a proxy for regional GDP or income measures, especially for the pre-industrial period (Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson, 2002; Nunn and Quiann, 2011). We argue that the relationship between urbanisation and growth, although interesting to study from a national point of view, is also crucial to understand within each country. Regions are central for understanding local labour markets, interactions between urban and rural locations and in the long-run the economic path taken by each country. Previous studies underline that many pre-industrial economies were not integrated at the national level (e.g. Federico, 2012), thus the relationship between urbanisation and growth should more likely show up at the regional, rather than national level.

Our main findings are that there is indeed a changing relationship between urbanisation and GDP per capita over the long-run. In 1570, the correlation between regional GDP per capita and the level of urbanization was positive but relatively weak and it only increased after 1900. Although our coefficients of correlation are very close to the world-wide estimates obtained by Jedwab and Vollrath (2015), we propose that the reason is not urbanisation without growth, but rather the opposite, i.e. growth without urbanisation. These results point to the need to understand more in detail what role urbanisation plays in economic growth, and more specifically when.
Persistent effects of historical partitions on educational achievements
Justyna Koscinska – University of Warsaw

The aim of the presentation is to share with other researchers experience from the ongoing project entitled “Persistent effects of historical partitions on educational achievements”. Currently, the project is in the middle of implementation. The main objective of the project is to gain better understanding of whether, and through what channels historically rooted differences in the institutional arrangements may exert persistent influence on the functioning, outcomes and social perception of education system. Hence, the project applies an interdisciplinary methodological approach. Accordingly, the project team includes the representatives of different fields, such as: economics, sociology, statistics, geography, mathematics and history. It is expected that the analysis will confirm the existence of statistically significant effect of historical (19th century) borders on the average school achievements in present-day Poland.

Poland is a valuable case for the research on the impact of historical partitions on social and economic development. The first reason for this is its history. There were three partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: in 1772, 1793 and the last one (with which the Commonwealth ceased to exist) in 1795. The partitions were conducted by the Russian Empire, the Kingdom of Prussia and Habsburg Austria. In the result, Poland hadn’t existed as the sovereign country for 123 years. In 1918, in the aftermath of World War I, the Polish state was recreated as the Second Polish Republic. After reunification, challenge of integrating these three regions in all sectors (including the education) had to be addressed. After World War II and the Yalta agreement, in 1945, borders of Poland were redefined. The parts of pre-war west and north-west German territories became part of Poland. They are called “Regained Territories”. Simultaneously, Poland lost its Easter territories to the Soviet Union.

Undoubtedly, the social and economic phenomena are path dependent. Theory of *longue durée* is present in social sciences since last century. There is a lot of classical sociological theories which explain an impact of path dependence on present institutions. Among the best known names there is, as follows: Torstein Veblen with theory of leisure class\(^1\), Douglass North with his works on institutions\(^2\) and Fernand Braudel with concept of *longue durée*\(^3\). Therefore, history matters also for education. The differences in learning outcomes cannot be explained only by the current inequality of direct inputs, such as family human capital, teachers, textbooks, equipment, class size, etc., but also by the historical factors.


This research tends to explain above described phenomenon while using different tools applied within various disciplines. For that reason, it combines different methods including quantitative techniques, qualitative tools and the elements of spatial analysis (preceded by historical analysis). The econometric tools used in research are: propensity score matching (PSM), regression discontinuity design (RDD). Quantitative techniques include cartographic analysis of external exams’ results based on standard deviation as well as questionnaire survey which will be held in October this year. Turning to quantitative analysis: in-depth interviews will be held in June 2017 during the study-visits of working team in three regional cities in different former annexed territories (Russian, Austrian and Prussian).

As could be expected, preliminary results show that territorial distribution of educational achievement in Poland reflects historical partitions, with Eastern and Southeastern regions performing significantly better at school tests than the Western part of the country. Eastern Poland outperforming the West is not a common finding in regional studies investigating the persistent effects of historical borders crossing Poland’s territory. In case of Poland, the regions formerly under Prussian rule mostly outperform the parts of the former Russian Empire (ex. per capita income, urbanization level etc.). Herbst and Rivkin explain better educational achievements in Russian and Austrian Partitions by higher social capital on these territories. In other words, an assumption can be made that its inhabitants are strongly rooted in local environment.

On the contrary, the worst exam results in Regained Territories can be explained by high structural unemployment following the bankruptcy of state own farms (PGR) in the early 1990s and also by the absence of long-lasting social institutions, resulting from population relocation. According to Bukowski, in Prussian Partition, thus, low educational results can be explained by the low student motivation and the social attitude connected to industrial history of region. Equally, tolerant Austrian rule left probably more space for the self-governing, and allowing to teach in Polish, may have resulted in persistent, positive attitude of students toward education.

To conclude, the project is in the process of introducing. The final report and results’ presentation is planned for December 2017th. Still, what is important is to be aware of other factors which may impact the educational results. These could be level of urbanization, school network in region (number of students per classroom etc.), cheating on exams (exam fraud) as well as differences between state instructions among the regions.

4 Herbst, M., Rivkin, S. (2013). Divergent historical experiences and inequality in academic achievement: The case of Poland. [In:] Journal of Socio-Economics, 42, p. 1-12
Comparative account of regional policies in UK based on mortality rates, 1945-1980
Katharine Timpson - University of the West of Scotland

Glasgow has an excess mortality (EM). Its mortality rates are higher than expected given its age, sex and deprivation profile, relative to Liverpool and Manchester – the next least healthy cities in the UK (Walsh et al, 2010). A multi-disciplinary explanatory model has been developed for this EM, drawing on, *inter alia*, epidemiology, population studies, regional studies, geography, politics and sociology (Walsh et al, 2016). The model illustrates differences between the cities which have been linked to health outcomes as well as considering elements which are known to impact health but which have been measured across the cities and found to be largely similar (Taulbut et al 2014; Walsh, 2013). The timing of the EM, which emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, suggested a link between it and the process of deindustrialisation. Although deindustrialisation has been linked to negative health outcomes, it was not more severe in Glasgow than in the other cities (Walsh et al, 2008). This prompted description of Glasgow as having been more ‘vulnerable’ to deindustrialisation than were the comparator cities (MacCartney et al, 2011).

This description required further context to explain the development of such a vulnerability. The particularities of Scottish regional policy between 1945 and 1980, and its approach to moving population out of the city of Glasgow, offers an account of how vulnerability could have been amassed (Walsh et al, 2016; Collins and Levitt, 2016). My PhD research provides a comparative account of how regional policy differentially impacted Liverpool, which also underwent planned population loss over this period. My work tests the hypothesis that Glasgow’s vulnerability was uniquely heightened, and draws out the regional policy decisions which protected Liverpool from developing similar vulnerability. This involved a shift in focus between the city-level and that of the region, comparing the impacts on Glasgow and Liverpool of developments in West Central Scotland (WCS) and North West England (NWE).

Secondary literature on the development of regional policy in the post-war era suggested that Scotland had followed a different trajectory to the rest of the UK, developing a more economically focused regional policy faster than other regions. This came through in plans produced within WCS and in the Scottish White Paper of 1963, which promoted the prioritisation of induced growth points. However, little was found to compare WCS directly with NWE which, when mentioned in planning literature, was described as ‘unremarkable’ in its approach (Wannop and Cherry, 1994). In order to present a full comparison for the WCS work, I investigated developments in NWE and their effects on Liverpool. Tracing the decision-making processes which led to the different conceptions, timings and implementation of regional policy between WCS and NWE involved archival research, and a historically focused set of methods. The WCS research centred on Scottish Office archives and National Archives; my NWE contribution has used the National Archives and Liverpool City Archives.
I found that the progress of regional policy in NWE was less coordinated, moved at a slower pace and was based on a more contested set of theoretical understandings. The Scottish White Paper of 1963, which directed subsequent policy in WCS, was clear in its presentation and selection of growth points (Scottish Development Department, 1963). In NWE, growth points were slower to be defined and designated and commitments from central government to growth points in NWE wavered throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Challenges arose from within the city of Liverpool, from the surrounding region and from members of the Board of Trade. These could be traced through plans produced by the City Planners in Liverpool, letters exchanged between government officials, discussion papers from NWE industrial associations, and in Cabinet meeting papers.

In the 1970s, there was a growing awareness throughout the UK of the negative effects on communities of the population loss which the regional policy of the 1950s and 1960s had engendered. The outcome of the divergent approaches to regional policy taken by Glasgow and Liverpool was that, although both cities lost proportionally similar amounts of population, Glasgow’s population loss was more skewed than Liverpool’s towards the young, the skilled and the employed, and the communities which remained in the city had been made vulnerable by this loss. Policy aimed at de-populating the cities had been less coherently pursued and had ceased earlier in Liverpool, meaning that some communities there were partially protected from the process of being broken up and moved outside of the city, and that the city’s demographic make-up remained somewhat more balanced than that of Glasgow. Thus, the evidence found thus far supports the argument that Glasgow was made more vulnerable due to regional policy from 1945 to 1980. Communities across the UK struggled to adapt to the policies of the 1980s, such as the increased pace of deindustrialisation alongside public sector cuts. This process was most pronounced in Glasgow.

In this presentation I will discuss my research process and interaction with the various archives. My work has developed iteratively, responding to the ongoing research of others, and so the methods used have evolved over the course of three phases of data collection and analysis. I will discuss the iterations, reflecting on what the historical methods of archival research have brought to my regional studies-based understanding of an epidemiological problem. As the work is ongoing, the conclusions are still crystallising.
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Structural policies, regional development and industrial specialisation The Italian case (1952-2002)
Fabio Lavista - Insubria University

How did the industrial specialisation of European countries change in the long run? Given the different patterns followed by each EU member state, is it possible to design continental industrial policies, aiming at harmonising the different models of development? The paper is the first output of an ongoing research aiming at answering to these two questions, starting from the observation that the European development process after World War II, in term of industrial structures, was a sequence of convergence (during the 1950s and 1960s) and divergence (after the 1970s crisis), determined by the interaction of the progressive economic integration and national structural policies.

The paper presents the Italian case, that is one on which the research is focussed. In particular, it analyses the effects of the policies established by the Italian government after World War II in order to industrialise the underdeveloped southern regions. The absence of a long-term planning of interventions and the preference for top-down actions led to the failure of these policies, with deep consequences, directly linked with the two opening questions: during the 1970s and the 1980s the need to preserve employment levels in an increasingly unstable macroeconomic environment, along with growing financial constraints, negatively influenced the attempts to modernise the Italian industry, with long-term negative effects on its structure, that is still today characterised by a specialisation in medium-low technology intensive sectors.
Changing regional policies: The Netherlands in comparative perspective (1975- onwards)
Bart Hoogeboom – Fryske Akademy /Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

While post-war European history is often characterized as the golden years of economic growth, many regions only experienced a matt glow. These areas could not catch up with the fast macro-economic developments, resulting in relative higher unemployment numbers and outward migration. With roots back in the 1920s, such regions were perceived as a societal problem and invoked interventions of the state. Politics of regional development reached its peak in the 1960s, a decade which can be seen as the heyday of regional industrialisation policies. In the Netherlands, for example, industrial zones were created in underdeveloped regions. In Belgium expansion laws were implemented in the late 1950s aimed at the industrialisation of backward regions in Flanders and industrial restructuring in vulnerable regions in Wallonia. These policies did not only involve large infrastructural projects like roads, canals and industrial parks, but also investment subsidies in underdeveloped areas. These Keynesian stimuli became increasingly controversial when used to save firms from bankruptcy during industrial decline in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

After the demise of Keynesian policies actors slowly embraced the paradigm of endogenous regional development, especially at the European level. This approach to regional economic planning is characterized by three distinctive elements. First, it is coordinated in a system of multi-level governance with the intent to decentralise the design and execution of plans to regional actors. Second, it is an economic theory that stresses the search for and strengthening of regional competitive advantage through regional cooperation of public and private actors. Third, it attempts to build a strong spatial identity not only by marketing the region in order to attract companies and tourists, but also by building a regional community based on shared traditions, values and a vision of the future. This is a vital step in order to generate the civic involvement required to realise what the European Union has labelled Community Led Development (CLD).

This research project consist out of a comparative analysis of regional development and regional policy from the 1970s onwards in three European rural regions. The case studies are Noordoost-Fryslân (Netherlands), Meetjesland (Belgium) and the Waldviertel (Austria). The effectiveness of endogenous development in these regions is analysed in relation to the three criteria discussed above. Evaluation of endogenous development policies requires long-term analysis of the interaction between regional, national and European actors. It is expected that national circumstances

are especially crucial in explaining different outcomes. The three countries have distinctive planning traditions; with a long history of regional industrialisation policies in the Netherlands, a late transition to Keynesian policies in Belgium and an early shift to endogenous development in Austria. Moreover, they differ in terms of political systems; Austria a federal state, Belgium caught up in a process of federalisation and the Netherlands a centralised state. Finally, the terms ‘rural’, ‘vulnerable’ and ‘endogenous potential’ only acquire meaning within a national economic context. The presentation and this paper will exclude the Austrian case because analysis is not yet of sufficient quality.

Divergent evolution: regional planning in Belgium and the Netherlands

Both the Netherlands and Belgium decentralised regional planning to some extent and shifted priorities to endogenous development. Nevertheless, profound differences in terms of planning traditions and institutional context exist between them. The Netherlands has a legacy in spatial planning and regional development with planners and economic experts producing national plans at regular intervals since the 1950s. Within these plans the idea of ‘bundled deconcentrating’ was the leading spatial concept. Policies were aimed at reducing uneven development by stimulating ‘centres of development’ in vulnerable regions. Belgium was far more liberal in its approach to spatial development, known for supporting private housing in the countryside and the urban sprawl these policies caused. Despite the seemingly disorderly and uncoordinated nature of Belgian planning there was an implicit spatial model behind post-war development in Belgium. Development tended to concentrate around canals and roads, creating “linear cities” along transport axes between agglomerations. However, this model never fully materialised in national plans.

Perhaps the best example of the divergent evolution in planning between the two countries is the position of the province in strategic (economic) planning. In the 1960s and 1970s the provinces gained considerable influence in planning with the Streekplannen in the Netherlands and the Gewestplannen in Belgium. The role of the province expanded in Dutch planning in subsequent decades. During the creation of a new spatial plan (2006) actors effectively decided that the national spatial plan wouldn’t be renewed and that strategic planning would become the responsibility of the

---


provincial government. In contrast, Belgian provincial plans were discontinued after 1980, when economic policy was decentralised from the federal level to the Flemish government. The newly established Flemish administration saw economic policy as its foremost priority and started a process of institutional reform. Although no longer Keynesian but neoliberal in priorities, the involvement of the Flemish government is by no means comparable to the laissez-faire attitude of the period before the 1960s. This more interventionist approach to spatial planning was formalised in the Ruimtelijk Structuurplan Vlaanderen (1997).

Endogenous development in Noordoost-Fryslân and Meetjesland

In both cases economic cooperation between municipalities emerged as a response to industrial decline in the 1970s and 1980s. Both received European funding in the LEADER II and Objective 5b programmes (1994-1999). This initial European involvement and subsequent LEADER cycles stimulated endogenous development in these regions. However, in Noordoost-Fryslân a strong legacy of industrialisation policies slowed the transition to new forms of development. Actors in Meetjesland were more successful in using the European stimulus to create sustainable initiatives. Nevertheless, this success was vulnerable when the Flemish government implemented institutional reforms. In contrast the Dutch government allows regional cooperation to develop more or less organically, potentially providing a more favourable institutional environment for endogenous regional development.

Noordoost-Fryslân has a relatively diverse economy specialised in the metal sector, construction, shipbuilding and food production. Most industries were either founded in the region or relocated to the region from the 1950s onwards. Noordoost-Fryslân was part of a larger development area in the province of Fryslân. Three designated ‘centres of development’ (Burgum, Dokkum, Kootstertille) were subjected to industrialisation policies including infrastructural projects, industrial parks and investment subsidies. Although these new industries faced stagnating demand and slow growth during the 1980s they proved to be relatively resilient over time. From the 1990s onwards policies also stimulated regional branding, tourism and multifunctional farming, mostly in the context of European and national development programmes. Nonetheless, the core policy objective of actors in Noordoost-Fryslân was to strengthen the manufacturing sector. They lobbied extensively for infrastructural projects and the expansion and revitalisation of industrial parks. This created antagonism between regional actors and the provincial government from the late 1980s to the early 2000s. Friesland aimed, in coordination with the provinces of Groningen and Drenthe, to concentrate

---
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development in a limited number of core zones and cities. Noordoost-Fryslân was part of what they called the rural ‘counterweight’ with only limited opportunities for industrial expansion. Eventually this disagreement dissolved in the late 2000s when Noordoost-Fryslân received considerable funding for a large infrastructural project.

Historically, Meetjesland was home to textile manufacturing and a furniture industry. Particularly the towns of Eeklo and Waarschoot formed the industrial heart of Meetjesland. Between the 1950s and the 1980s these industries were in decline and almost completely vanished from the regional economy. However, in line with the linear city model considerable development took place along the peripheries of the region at the Ghent-Terneuzen axis and the Ghent-Burges axis. Particularly the historically rural town of Aalter successfully took charge of its own development by financing industrial parks along the canal and road between Bruges and Ghent. Moreover, the industrial decline of traditional sectors was partly offset by the development of a strong food industry cluster. In the long run the edges of the region were close to becoming suburbs of Ghent while the northern part of the region remained more rural, with lower population densities and more farming.

This heterogeneity in terms of economic characteristics made it difficult to find common interests for regional development. However, a well-established regional identity successfully boosted by a long-running regional marketing campaign and several influential and capable actors (politicians, regional managers and entrepreneurs) stimulated regional development in the period from 1995 to 2010. After this momentum was solidified in well-functioning regional networks the Flemish government intervened. The Streekplatformen (regional platforms) established in 1995 were replaced by Regional Economic Consolation Committees (RESOC’s) in 2004. Because actors in Meetjesland were satisfied with their regional platform they refused to discontinue the platform and ended up with two competing power structures.
Making ‘Modern’ Scotland: Industrial Policy-Making and Application in Lanarkshire c.1940-1980s
Edward Gibbs – University of the West of Scotland

Historical case studies offer a means to understand long-term trends in policy which condition changes in regional economic performance. This is beneficial in appraising policy-making, implementation and evolution. A historical standpoint facilitates a comprehensive overview of how ideological outlooks, policy objectives and implementation united and divided national and local public officials and politicians, private sector actors and other stakeholders. These processes have renewed relevance given the growing interest in industrial policy.

This paper analyses a policy-network that connected civil servants, academic economists and business actors which aimed at the ‘modernisation’ of Scotland’s industrial base over the mid and late twentieth century. It does so through a case study of the county of Lanarkshire. In 1945 Lanarkshire was Scotland’s principal steelmaking centre and largest coalfield, which was designated for decline. Lanarkshire underwent extensive economic and social reconstruction through New Towns construction and inward investment in mass production engineering sectors.

Policy-makers outlooks are historicised; commitments to interventionist applied economics developed through the failure of laissez-faire economics during the interwar period. A review of three major reports that shaped priorities between the 1940s and 1970s, and Scottish Office correspondence, reveals civil society actors shaped policy-making but also demonstrates local diversion. The analysis utilises case studies of four US owned manufacturing plants. This exemplifies the value of beneath the surface interactions between public and private sector organisations in evaluating policy implementation, success or failure, and understanding the actual connections and mechanisms which determined outcomes.
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