

EDITOR'S CORNER

We are delighted to announce that two articles which recently appeared in the *Business History Review* have been awarded prizes.

David C. Mowery, associate professor of social sciences at Carnegie-Mellon University, has been named a co-winner of the Fritz Redlich Prize for his essay, "Firm Structure, Government Policy, and the Organization of Industrial Research: Great Britain and the United States, 1900–1950," which appeared in the Winter 1984 issue of the *Review*. He shares the award with Ann Kussmaul and her article on agrarian change in seventeenth-century England, which appeared in the March 1985 issue of the *Journal of Economic History*. The Redlich Prize is awarded every two years by the Economic History Association to the best article published in a journal covering the fields of economic and business history.

William F. Trimble, assistant professor of history at Auburn University, has been awarded the third annual U.S. Navy Prize in Naval History for his article, "The Naval Aircraft Factory, the American Aviation Industry, and Government Competition, 1919–1928," which appeared in the Summer 1986 issue of the *Business History Review*. The prize, which carries a cash award of \$500 and a certificate, is jointly sponsored by the Naval Historical Center and the Naval Historical Foundation.

The Harvard Business School and the Newcomen Society of the United States announce a postdoctoral fellowship in business history to support twelve months of residence, study, and research at the Harvard Business School for the academic year 1988–89. The residence period for next year's Fellow will begin on 1 September 1988.

The purpose of this award is to enable scholars who have received their Ph.D. in history, economics, or a related discipline within the past ten years to improve their professional acquaintance with business and economic history, to increase their skills as they relate to this field, and to engage in research that will benefit from the resources of the Harvard Business School and the Boston scholarly community. The successful applicant will be asked to participate in the school's business history course, seminar, and case development activities.

Those interested should request an application form from:

Professor Alfred D. Chandler, Jr.
Baker Library 214
Harvard Business School
Soldiers Field
Boston, MA 02163

Applications for the 1988–89 Newcomen Fellowship must be received no later than 15 March 1988.

Harvard is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer.

The American Historical Association announces its 1988–89 Fellowship in Aerospace History, supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), which will support at least one Fellow. Research topics in all aspects of the history of flight, including cultural and intellectual history, economic history, history of law and public policy, and the history of science, engineering, and management, are eligible. The fellowship term is a minimum of six months and a maximum of one year; Fellows are encouraged to spend their time in residence at NASA headquarters or in one of the NASA centers.

Applicants must be U.S. citizens. They must possess a doctoral degree in history or a closely related field or be enrolled as a student in a doctoral program. The maximum stipend for those holding the doctorate is \$25,000 and for graduate students, \$12,000. A travel allowance of up to \$1,000 is available for relocation and other travel expenses. Fellows may not hold other major fellowships or grants during the fellowship term, except sabbatical or supplemental grants from their home institutions and small grants from other sources for specific research expenses.

The deadline for both applications and letters of recommendation is 1 February 1988. The application forms and additional information may be obtained by writing to the Fellowship in Aerospace History, American Historical Association, 400 A Street SE, Washington, DC 20003. The telephone number is 202/544–2422.

The University of Cincinnati Social History Conference will be held on 22 October 1988. Scholars in all areas of social history are encouraged to submit papers with no limitations of methodology, geography, or period. One-page abstracts of paper proposals should be submitted no later than 16 May 1988. The abstracts and requests for further information should be addressed to Nina Mjagkij, chair, UC Social History Conference, Department of History, 360 McMicken Hall, Mail Location 373, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221.

The Second Canadian Business History Conference will meet at the University of Victoria on 3–5 March 1988. For further information, please contact Peter Baskerville, Department of History, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, V8W 2Y2, Canada; the telephone number is 604/721–7393.

The University of Texas at Austin is sponsoring an international symposium on 25–26 February 1988 commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Mexican oil nationalization. Adrián Lajous, executive coordinator for international trade of *Petroleos Mexicanos*, will deliver the keynote address. The first of two working sessions concerns the historical antecedents of the 1938 crisis and features papers by Lief Adleson, Jonathan Brown, Alan Knight, Lorenzo Meyer, and Barry Carr. The second session, covering the role of Pemex and petroleum in Mexico since nationalization, includes papers by George Philip, Miguel Wionczek, Fabio Barbosa, Ruth Adler, and Gabriel Szekely. Interested scholars are welcome. Further information may be obtained from Alan Knight

and Jonathan Brown, Department of History, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

The Economic and Business Historical Society (EBHS) will hold its annual meeting in Toronto, Canada, on 28–30 April 1988. Organized in 1975, the EBHS encourages interdisciplinary scholarship in the areas of business and economic history and the application of historical concepts to business issues. The international membership includes historians, economists, business people, social scientists, and others who share these common interests. For additional information, please contact Christine Rosen, president, EBHS, School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720; the telephone number is 415/642–8695.

The Hagley Museum and Library announces the availability of research fellowships for 1988–89. Advanced Research Fellowships, funded by the NEH and the Mellon Foundation, support study in the humanities or those aspects of the social sciences that employ historical or philosophical approaches at the Hagley's Center for the History of Business, Technology, and Society. Fellowships, for six to twelve months, carry a maximum stipend of \$27,500 and cannot be held by degree candidates. Applicants must be American citizens or have been resident in the United States for the three years immediately preceding the term of fellowship. Completed applications must be received by 15 February 1988; awards will be announced by 1 April 1988.

Short-term grants-in-aid are also offered for the calendar year 1988. These grants support two- to eight-week stays at the Hagley and are available to both degree candidates and advanced scholars; they will not exceed \$750 per month of study. Applications are accepted throughout the year.

The Hagley also offers one-year dissertation fellowships of \$10,000 to doctoral candidates studying at universities near the museum's facilities who would benefit by working in the holdings of the Center for the History of Business, Technology, and Society. Recipients must take part in Center programs. One dissertation fellowship, with a stipend of \$12,000, is offered to applicants from any university in the United States or abroad. The recipient must demonstrate the strong relevance of Hagley's collections to the dissertation topic, spend nine to twelve months in residence, and take part in Center programs. Completed applications for both types of dissertation awards must be received by 15 February 1988; awards will be announced by 1 April 1988.

For additional information about all of these programs, please write to Elizabeth Gray Kogan, Center for the History of Business, Technology, and Society, Hagley Museum and Library, P.O. Box 3630, Wilmington, DE 19807; the telephone number is 302/658–2400, ext. 244.

The University College of London has available for research the papers of Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), comprised of some 174 boxes of manuscripts and original editions of most of Bentham's works. Seminars are conducted by the Bentham Project staff, who are currently engaged in preparing for publi-

cation a comprehensive scholarly edition of Bentham's works and correspondence. Requests for information should be sent to Dr. F. Rosen, The Bentham Project, University College of London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, England.

The following communication has been received:

To the editor:

Our attention has just been called to Professor Gilbert's review of our book, *The Management of Monopoly*, . . . , in your *Review* (Autumn 1985, pp. 517–18). We feel flattered by the recognition of some merit in the book. But we are disturbed by the liberty taken in attributing to us ideas and phrases that are neither used nor intended, that is:

(1) We are said to have claimed the East India Company as "a 'model of bureaucratic efficiency' (p. 31)." On the page cited, our words are: "We would suggest that in London at least, the Company's bureaucratic structure was a model of *its kind*. . . ." (emphasis added). The context is spelled out in the preceding sentence: "Whatever may be the final assessment of bureaucracies, no large-scale organization can be rationally and effectively managed by any other known system.³⁰" The remainder of the paragraph specifies the content "of its kind."

Throughout this chapter (pp. 23–43), the word "efficient" is used once (p. 34)—for alliterative purpose—but "effective" (or "effectiveness") is used twelve times (pp. 24, 25, 31, 33, 34—thrice—37, 38—twice—39, 43). It should be amply clear that the two are *different*.

(2) In the review, Professor Gilbert quotes from the book: "They 'failed to discover economic theses on monopolistic behaviour that are constructed on an assumption other than [profit] maximization' (p. 2)." The added word in square brackets makes non-sense of our understanding of business organizations and behaviour. Of course, we are familiar with the maximization of other objectives than profit. Nevertheless, we thank Professor Gilbert for the gratuitous lecture.

Professor Gilbert ends his review by accusing us of failing to identify the critics of the East India Company, inadequately representing their criticism, and dismissing various items in a line or two. From the beginning, we have seriously considered this aspect of the subject. A brief history of it is given on pp. 1–2 with endnotes. Sources of criticism are identified at least in endnote 47 (chap. 2, p. 163). Items of criticism are specified in chaps. 3 and 4—fourteen times from p. 45 to p. 90—besides a careful and detailed consideration of Adam Smith's comments on the subject (pp. 128–37). Rather than dismissing the criticism in a line or two, we discuss each item in detail in long paragraphs, sometimes pages, and not all items are shown to be wrong, as any reader can verify.

Yours sincerely,
Hoh-cheung Mui
Lorna H. Mui
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Professor Gilbert responded as follows:

Dear Professor Tedlow:

Some eight issues back, the *BHR* carried my review of the Muis' book on the East India Company's China tea trade. They now register objections to parts of it. Let me respond to their points in order:

(1) If the Muis are uncomfortable with the characterization of the East India Company as a model of bureaucratic efficiency, and if it was not their intention so to characterize it, this will come as a surprise to most readers of the book. Indeed, I would have judged this to be among the central theses of the book, announced as early as p. xiii of the preface and implicit throughout. The word count is completely beside the point.

(2) My bracketed pairing of "profit" with "maximization" was an effort to make sense of the sentence quoted. The preceding sentence specifically refers to profit maximization; no other kind of maximization is mentioned in the paragraph; hence the assumption made. In any case, the real issue for this reviewer remains one of judgment: How can one ask the right questions about—much less, make convincing sense of—a monopoly's economic performance without drawing upon the economic literature on monopoly? How can one illuminate the behavior of a bureaucratic organization without reference to the available literature on organizations and bureaucracy?

(3) I continue to believe that giving short shrift to the E.I.C.'s critics—offering up their views in scattered, unquoted, unattributed snippets, or "items," of criticism—undermines reader interest. This, of course, is a matter of opinion; others may see it differently. As to the Muis' discussion of Adam Smith and the East India Company, they themselves give all the reasons (p. 129) why Smith's 1776 views must be considered irrelevant to the post-1784 tea trade. If they wanted to explore in depth a classical economist's critique of the E.I.C., I would have thought J. R. McCulloch a more pertinent choice.

Yours sincerely,
Geoffrey Gilbert
Hobart and William Smith Colleges

[Letters to the editor are published verbatim and at the discretion of the editors.]