The first volume under review is a collection of more than 20 original contributions by some of Alan S. Milward’s academic companions. According to the editors Fernando Guirao, Frances M.B. Lynch and Sigfrido M. Ramírez Pérez, it was their intention “to honor Alan Milward by celebrating his lifelong research” (p. xxiii). The contributions were gathered to reflect upon the various facets of Milward’s academic productivity from the mid-1960s until 2007. Ramírez Pérez, a former doctoral student of Milward, took the initiative for gathering the contributions in 2007 when Milward became incurably ill. The project was realized with the support of Frances M.B. Lynch, Milward’s wife, and Fernando Guirao, a long-standing colleague of Milward. Despite the close personal relations of the editors and contributors to Milward, the result is an intellectually stimulating book for all researchers who deal with European history.

Lynch and Guirao open the volume with a comprehensive, almost 130-page introduction in which they both present Milward’s academic research and outline the topics of the contributions by historians, economists, political scientists and sociologists. The essays focus the main themes of Milward’s work: political economy, especially with regard to Britain and Germany, the history of contemporary Europe and European integration, as well as the role of the nation-state in Europe. Finally, in a concluding chapter, Ramírez Pérez brings together the results of the preceding chapters for future research in the tradition of Milward. The volume is completed by three appendices listing Milward’s career history, his published work from 1964 to 2007 and the completed Ph.D. theses for which he was a supervisor, a bibliography, and an index.

At the time of publication, the volume was a first assessment of Milward’s legacy for the historiography of Europe and European integration. This volume was followed by a special volume of the *Journal of*
European Integration History containing inter alia four hitherto unpublished papers by Milward and by a collection of Milward’s published academic reviews which is the second volume under review here (see below).

According to Lynch and Guirao, Milward “sought to explain contemporary history through an understanding of the forces responsible for economic change”; and for Milward, “one of the most powerful of these forces in contemporary Europe was the state” (1). In his historical research, Milward thus combined government archives, usually from multiple countries, with statistical economic material in order to analyze the relationship between economic, strategic, and political factors for the course of history. This approach, which Lynch and Guirao define as “the Milwardian method” (10 f.), was first exemplified in his own Ph.D. thesis and his subsequent first book The German Economy at War (1965) in which he analyzed Germany’s economic strategy in World War II. The combination of analyzing domestic economic objectives and foreign policy became characteristic of his academic work.

Milward applied this approach to the study of Western European integration, too, which became the focal point of his academic research in the 1980s. It seems only logical that Milward, who once supplemented in The German Economy at War a mere economic approach by adding political and government sources to the analysis, now supplemented the diplomatic or political history of European integration by a consistent economic approach. Lynch and Guirao rightly point out Milward’s argument in The European Rescue of the Nation-State (1992) “that the origins of both the European boom and European integration lay in the political priorities set by some national governments rather than being driven by purely economic factors or ideas about uniting Europe” (91). And it is also more than a coincidence that Milward vigorously opposed the argument of Walter Lipgens concerning the impact of European resistance and federalist movements on the process of European integration after the end of World War II. Milward’s argument since The Reconstruction of Western Europe (1984) that these movements had only marginal impact on the policies of West European governments and their pursuit of supranational integration points back to his early works, especially The New Order and the French Economy (1970), in which he also puts into perspective the importance of the Résistance for the economic failure of the German occupation in France. In The Reconstruction of Western Europe and subsequently in The European Rescue of the Nation-State, Milward developed his argument that supranational European integration since the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) did not imply a loss of nation-state control over national economic policies, but rather that it served their respective national interests and enabled them to pursue their national economic strategies in times of international interdependence. Lynch and Guirao summarize: “Although Alan Milward was not the first to emphasize the resilience of the European nation-state, he was the first to argue that integration was a positive choice taken by EC member states primarily, although not exclusively, for domestic social and economic reasons. It was a
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nonliberal solution to a number of problems facing the European nation-states which neither
governments nor markets could solve on their own” (101).

Lynch’s and Guirao’s assumption, however, according to which Milward undertook “a lifelong search to
find a theory of historical change” (127) is not thoroughly substantiated, even though they seem to
acknowledge that it was rather an “implicit theory” (ibid.). It is the historian’s task to analyze historical
change—and so did Milward. Milward did not set up a theory, but expanded the historian’s
methodological capability to track changes in the course of history. Lynch and Guirao are thus right when
they state that for Milward “the drivers of benign historical change in a democracy were domestic politics
rather than external pressures arising from the international economy or the work of diplomats” (129).
There are good reasons for an interpretation of this type, but this is far from constituting a theory of
historical change. Lynch and Guirao themselves cite Milward’s co-authored textbook *The Development of
the Economies of Continental Europe, 1850-1914* (1977) in which Milward and Samuel Berrick Saul
emphasize that “[w]e have deliberately used no single model of analysis because it was obvious to us that
the variety of experience was so vast that to attempt to place the process of European development within
a single framework would involve an unacceptable distortion and simplification of historical reality” (36).
Lynch and Guirao acknowledge that Milward remained skeptical about the prospects of finding a theory
of historical change. However, according to them, Milward concluded that sustainable historical change
has ever been a gradual process: “The lessons of history which he drew upon in formulating his theory
was that for change – social, political, and economic – to be sustainable, it had to be a gradual process
rather than one resulting from a sudden, cataclysmic revolutionary event occurring in one sector of the
economy or society. Benign change depended much less on natural economic endowment or
 technological developments than on the ability of state institutions to respond to changing political
demands from within each society” (128).

Even if Milward did not develop a comprehensive theory of historical change, he comprehensively
changed the way in which the history of Europe and European integration has been conceptualized and
written since *War, Economy and Society, 1939-1945* (1977) or *The European Rescue of the Nation-State.*
For this, the volume offers good proof. The 23 contributions dealing with the main topics and/or specific
aspects of Milward’s academic research display the diversity of his academic interests. As concerns his
studies on European integration and European history as a whole, it becomes clear that Milward’s
politico-economic approach was more than a mere counter-project to Walter Lipgen’s early ideational
interpretations of European integration. Wilfried Loth has more than once plausibly explained that both
approaches are complementary rather than fundamentally incompatible; and so he does in his
contribution to the present volume.7

---

7 Alan S. Milward, Samuel B. Saul, *The Development of the Economies of Continental Europe, 1850-1914*


7 Wilfried Loth, “Integrating Paradigms: Walter Lipgens and Alan Milward as Pioneers of European Integration
History,” 255-267. See also, for example, Wilfried Loth, “Explaining European Integration: The Contribution from
At first sight, the main disadvantage of the volume due to its composition is the partial redundancy of some of the aspects which re-occur in more than one chapter. Both Charles S. Maier and John Gillingham, for example, recapitulate some of Milward’s main publications. This is not a reproach directed at the authors, but the question arises whether this is necessary immediately after the introductive chapter by Lynch and Guirao. This supposed disadvantage, however, turns into an advantage where contrasting views on Milward become apparent, for instance in the chapters of Jan van der Harst or Ben Rosamond concerning the relationship between historiography and political science. Most interesting are those chapters in which particular aspects of the general argument of Milward’s publications are exemplified or in which Milward’s works are the starting point for further analysis, such as in the chapter by Hans Otto Frøland on Nazi Planning and the Aluminium Industry in which Milward’s arguments are put to the test on the basis of new evidence, in this case from Norwegian industry. Other contributors, such as Maud Anne Bracke, hardly refer to Milward or make clear how they were inspired by his academic research. Based on the various contributions in the volume, in his concluding chapter co-editor Ramírez Pérez assesses the actual relevance of Milward’s work for current and future research, not only in history and social sciences, but also for the discussion about the future of European societies. Notwithstanding the differences between the contributions of the various authors, it becomes clear that Milward contributed to the renewal of economic history by developing a “historical political economy” approach that emphasized the role of the nation-state for the economic development in Western Europe in the interwar and postwar period. Ramírez Pérez also considers Milward, the author of War, Economy and Society, 1939-1945, “a pioneer in the global interpretation of the Second World War”. However, Ramírez Pérez and other contributions in the volume are not confined to emphasizing Milward’s merits, but also mention the limits of his approach. In the case of the history of European integration, for example, Milward’s state-centred politico-economic approach with a strong focus on national archives is challenged by a new focus on non-state actors—and transnational, constructivist approaches. In this respect, the chapter by Kiran Klaus Patel is most relevant. Patel stresses that the cultural dimension of European
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integrated matters—at least when the “socioeconomic circumstances” (406) in which they occur or in
which they gain importance are taken into consideration.

The second volume under review, Alan S. Milward and Contemporary European History. Collected
Academic Reviews, contains 241 book reviews and review articles by Milward from 1965 to 2007 (i.e.
more than the 213 reviews listed in the first volume), some of them (originally written in German and
French) for the first time translated into English. The review volume, too, opens with an introduction by
Guirao and Lynch and is completed by another bibliography of the publications referred to in the various
reviews and review articles as well as by an index. According to Guirao and Lynch, Milward’s reviews are
not only relevant with regard to the merits and/or limits of the various books under review, but they are
also important for the understanding and evolution of his own academic work: “He [Milward] used book
reviews and review articles not only to debate many of the questions which interested him at the time but
also to serve as a platform for summarising those of his arguments which had sometimes been lost or
overlooked in the density of his own books, or misunderstood and misrepresented in subsequent scholarly
work” (2). Milward thus used the reviews in the best sense for adapting his interpretations of European
history to contemporary developments. And his arguments were always based on an informed economic
history focus that preserved his thought from idealistic exaggerations of future prospects, for example, in
the case of the European monetary integration. Milward, of course, was not the only one who foresaw the
disintegrative consequences of the European Monetary Union, but his clairvoyant criticism shows that
historical knowledge may provide relevant insights for the present. Indeed, according to Ramírez Pérez,
Milward’s factual approach was based on the assumption that “historical knowledge serves to empower
citizens if based on the interpretation of facts, and not just on beliefs” (523). In today’s world, this is not
the worst legacy for an historian of Europe and European integration.
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