
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

Author(s): Ojala, Jari

Title: Editor's Note

Year: 2017

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Ojala, J. (2017). Editor's Note. Scandinavian Economic History Review, 65(2), 113-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03585522.2017.1325088>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Editor's note

Jari Ojala

This issue of the Scandinavian Economic History Review introduces new members to our editorial team: Paul Sharp from the University of Southern Denmark and Elina Kuorelahti from the University of Helsinki. Paul will complement our editorial team with his knowledge on matters Danish, but especially with his expertise on long-term economic growth and econometric modelling. Elina Kuorelahti, in turn, will work as our book review editor. With her wide language capabilities, SEHR will in the future be able to offer reviews on books published in all the Nordic languages.

As new editors are starting, old ones are stepping down: both Alfred Reckendrees and Espen Storli chose to retire from our editorial team. I am deeply grateful to Alfred, who worked as an editor and editor-in-chief since 2011. In his first editorial, Alfred together with Jacob Weisdorf, endeavoured to internationalize the journal (Reckendrees & Weisdorf 2011) by introducing authors and topics covering issues beyond Scandinavia. During his term of editorship this was indeed achieved. Moreover, together with Jacob Weisdorf, he invited the international advisory board and associate editors to give insights and develop the journal further. He was also the driving force when launching the on-line submission system to SEHR six years ago. Thus, Alfred Reckendrees has offered major contributions towards further developing and modernizing the journal, which is witnessed by its inclusion in the *Web of Science* index last year. I am equally grateful to Espen for his long and gratuitous work as our book review editor. The book review section is, indeed, an essential part of the SEHR, but would not have been so without Espen's commitment. On behalf of the whole editorial team: thank you, Alfred and Espen!

It is also time to thank our reviewers: scholars who devote their time and expertise to improving the contents of the articles. Without the work of these volunteers, the running of a journal would be impossible. The complete list of peer reviewers in 2015 and 2016 is included as an appendix to this editorial.

As stated in a number of previous editorials, the editors hope that the *Scandinavian Economic History Review* can offer a forum for debates and discussions. (Reckendrees, 2017; Ojala & Reckendrees, 2016). The article by Deirdre Nansen McCloskey (2016) on the origins of the

“Great Enrichment” has indeed raised debate. In this issue, McCloskey replies to Barry R. Weingast (2016) and Erik Ringmar participates in this debate by showing that both McCloskey and Weingast are right: McCloskey when emphasizing the role of “ideas” and Weingast when stressing the role of “institutions” for the Great Enrichment. Ringmar, however, duly notes that perhaps institutions as such should be defined more broadly which, in turn, might help us to better understand the role of institutions in economic development. We thank all the authors for such thought-provoking discussion. At this point, though, we will close this particular debate. However, we hope that the authors have induced our readers to submit empirical studies to further elaborate the role played by *ideas* and *institutions* in economic growth.

Besides the McCloskey–Weingast debate this issue of the *Scandinavian Economic History Review* features five research articles. Adnan Türegün offers an outsider’s view of economic policies in the Nordic countries after the Great Depression – focusing especially on the Swedish case. He aims to dispel myths about the responses that can be found in the literature. He concludes that what has previously perhaps been thought of as a peculiarly Swedish response is less so when compared with other Scandinavian countries. Erik Bengtsson and Jakob Molinder, in turn, study the effects of the 1920 eight-hour working day reform in Sweden, which was the largest wage push in Swedish history – as the labour force worked less for the same salary. According to them, these effects differed across sectors as home-market industries were able to increase prices as a consequence of the wage increase, while export industries were less able to do so. Similarly, labour force in different industries benefitted differently: for those working with non-traded manufacturing and services the real wages increased significantly relative to those working with industries engaging in traded manufacturing industries. Moreover, the workers in the latter group were also more likely to lose their jobs.

The article by Rodney Edvinsson and Therese Nordlund Edvinsson combines an historical narrative approach with econometric analysis to show that there was a distinct “housewife era” in Sweden from the 1930s to the 1970s. Paradoxically, according to their article, patriarchy was reinforced after the women’s right to work was strengthened in the late 1930s. The decline of agriculture and the greater share of married population led by the 1950s to the lowest point in Sweden in women’s paid working hours. During the following decades the institutional changes increased the labour force participation of married women. Roger Svensson in his article analyses medieval periodic re-coinage, in which old coins were frequently replaced with new ones – a practice that also generated tax revenue for rulers. He

confirms the theory that re-coinage was a symptom of backwardness, limited monetisation and the fact that Sweden had three separate currency areas. As monetisation increased, periodic re-coinage became more difficult, leading to longer lasting coins and also to one single coinage area.

Magnus Bohman provides an analysis of an agro-ecological crisis in early 19th-century Southern Sweden as drifting sands harmed the agricultural production that was already challenged by the population increase. The actions taken to plant trees to prevent sand from drifting and the introduction of new crops indeed enabled the reclamation of land and increased production capacity. As shown by Bohman, however, changes in markets and institutions in the form of a reform in the enclosure also played an important role in the area that from the 1830s onwards produced more agricultural products than it consumed.

References

- McCloskey, D. N. (2016). The great enrichment: a humanistic and social scientific account. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 64(1), 6-18.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03585522.2016.1152744>
- Ojala, J., & Reckendrees, A. (2016) Towards debate and open conversation. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 64(1), 1-5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03585522.2016.1152767>
- Reckendrees, A., & Weisdorf, J. (2011). Editors' note. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 59(2), 99-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03585522.2011.581486>
- Reckendrees, A. (2017). Economic history in times of transition. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 65(1), 1-5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03585522.2017.1294378>
- Weingast, B. R. (2016). Exposing the neoclassical fallacy: McCloskey on ideas and the great enrichment. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 64(3), 189-201.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03585522.2016.1233134>

APPENDIX. List of peer reviewers for Scandinavian Economic History review in 2015 and 2016

Abildgren, Kim

Albinsson, Staffan

Autio-Sarasmo, Sari

Basberg, Bjørn

Baten, Jörg

Becker, Bert

Bengtsson, Erik

Bengtsson, Tommy

Bohlin, Jan

Cinnirella, Francesco

Colli, Andrea

Devereux, John

Di Matteo, Livio

Dodds, Benjamin

Domenec, Jordi

Edvinsson, Rodney

Eloranta, Jari

Enflo, Kerstin

Englund, Peter

Eriksson, Martin

Fellman, Susanna

Frederico, Giovanni

Fregert, Klas

Gadd, Carl-Johan

Giertz, Anders

Golson, Eric

Grytten, Ola

Häkkinen, Antti
Hannikainen, Matti
Heikkinen, Sakari
Hibbs, jr., Douglas
Hilson, Mary
Hynninen, Sanna-Mari
Isacson, Maths
Jensen-Eriksen, Niklas
Jonung, Lars
Kærgaard , Niels
Karonen, Petri
Katajala-Peltomaa, Sari
Kauko, Karlo
Kettunen, Pauli
Klovland, Jan
Kobrak, Chris
Kokkinen, Arto
Kuhlberg, Mark
Kurosawa, Takafumi
Lamberg, Juha-Antti
Lamberg, Marko
Lampe, Markus
Lappalainen, Mirkka
Lindmark, Magnus
Lloyd, Chris
Lundh, Christer

Lutter, Mark

Mäkeler, Henrik

Maliranta, Mika

Mangeloja, Esa

Markkola, Pirjo

Mattila, Markku

Melander, Anders

Millward, Robert

Minns, Chris

Monnet, Eric

Morell, Mats

Nielsson, Ulf

Nuvolari, Alessandro

Ottosson, Jan

Owen, Thomas

Paloheimo, Maare

Pehkonen, Jaakko

Pettersson, Thomas

Prado, Svante

Prados de la Escosura, Leandro

Sandvik, Pål Thonstad

Sapoznik, Alexandra

Särkkä, Timo

Schröter, Harm

Schularick, Moritz

Seltzer, Andrew

Sharp, Paul

Sjögren, Hans

Snellman, Hanna

Söderberg, Johan

Stanfors, Maria

Streb, Jochen

Uebele, Martin

Valtonen, Heli

van Nederveen Meerkerk, Elise

Voutilainen, Miikka

Waldenström, Daniel

Walhout, Evelien

Wolf, Niko