DONALD WINCH

Donald Norman Winch

15 April 1935 – 12 June 2017

elected Fellow of the British Academy 1986

by

STEFAN COLLINI
Fellow of the Academy

Although the history of economic thought had traditionally been regarded as an integral part of the discipline of Economics, in recent decades it has come more and more to be seen by economists as marginal or even antiquarian. At the same time, it has been increasingly cultivated within the field of Intellectual History, which encourages a more thoroughly historical and thick-textured treatment of past ideas. No single figure has been more central to this transition than Donald Winch. Trained as an economist, he developed an interest in the history of economic thought early on. Over time, encouraged especially by the innovative structure of the University of Sussex, where he taught for almost forty years, and by a group of congenial colleagues there, Winch became the leading intellectual historian of British economic thought of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, notably in *Riches and Poverty* (1996) and *Wealth and Life* (2009).

Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy, XVIII, 471–496
Posted 21 November 2019.

DONALD WINCH

The process we refer to as the 'professionalisation' of academic disciplines is never uniform or constant, but it does display a familiar tendency to move from encompassing, catholic, or baggy conceptions of a field to more purist senses of identity. Concerns that were once considered integral to a form of intellectual enquiry can come to be shunted to the sidelines, even expelled altogether. Yet in time this marginalised matter may find a home within a different specialism, perhaps one that is governed by other conceptions of rigour and relevance, or even one that is, for the time being, more hospitable to apparent untidiness. In recent decades, Economics has been a striking example of such disciplinary purification, as more technical, theoretical, and in many cases mathematical, approaches have come to dominate the field's understanding of its own nature and scope. One of the casualties of this narrowing focus has been the history of economic thought, once seen as an established part of the discipline and a required element in the education of economists, now increasingly regarded by many within the profession as a form of antiquarianism, best left to the retired or the also-rans. At the same time, the remarkable growth of Intellectual History in the past two generations has begun to re-insert past economic thinking into a much more thickly-textured understanding of the intellectual life of earlier periods. Instead of a triumphalist narrative that tended to tell a story of past error giving way to present truth, the intellectual history of economic thought attempts to recover the complexity of that thought, to appreciate its often various inspirations and purposes as well as its deep involvement with styles of enquiry that subsequently became the property of neighbouring scholarly disciplines. Few individuals experienced this transition in their own careers as intensely and fruitfully as Donald Winch; none made a more significant contribution to the present flourishing of the intellectual history of economic thought.

Donald studied Economics as an undergraduate at the London School of Economics (LSE) in the mid-1950s, a time and place confident in its understanding of that subject as a broad and fairly traditional discipline, one that was of central relevance to a wide range of policies. He did his PhD at Princeton in the late 1950s in an Economics department that was uneasily making the transition from a long-standing, heterogeneous conception of the field to one more dominated by a mathematised form of microeconomics. But already his own interests were coming to focus on the history of political economy, and although he was appointed to lectureships in Economics at, first, Edinburgh and, then, Sussex, the trajectory of his research and writing started to take him away from the hardening identity of his parent discipline. He found a more congenial home in the then still somewhat derogated or underdeveloped field of Intellectual History, and began to make major contributions to our understanding of social, political, and economic thinking in Britain from the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the twentieth. He ended his career as Emeritus Professor of Intellectual History, feted across the world for his learned,

analytical, sometimes combative contributions to this broadened history. Yet he never altogether severed ties with the discipline of Economics in its contemporary form, remaining, for example, Publications Secretary of the Royal Economic Society until 2016 and an active member of the Economics section of the British Academy for over thirty years. His forthright championing of the claims of a genuinely historical approach to past economic thinking did not always make for amicable relations with those who understood their discipline as a more abstract and systematic enterprise, but his distinctive manner of combining mastery of theoretical issues and deep familiarity with historical context gave him a special standing and an unusual authority.

I

Donald Norman Winch was born on 15 April 1935, the only child of Iris (née Button) and Sidney Winch. Iris came from a family of agricultural workers in Suffolk, her widowed mother moving to London with her three young children and supporting them by working as a cleaner. Sidney belonged to a longer-established London working-class family: his father was a stone-mason, and Sidney was apprenticed to him in the 1920s. After they were married, the young couple managed to buy a small modern house on a new housing estate in North Cheam in south-west London, where Donald lived with his parents until he was 21 (apart from the period during the Second World War when he and his mother were evacuated to the Lake District). Sidney served in the Royal Navy during the war, contracting a kidney ailment that involved a long stay in hospital and meant he was not strong enough to resume work as a stone-mason once he was finally discharged. After the war he had a succession of jobs, including working as a cashier for a wholesale greengrocer's at Covent Garden. Only after Donald had left home to go as a postgraduate to the USA did Sidney and Iris sell the family home in North Cheam and buy a small greengrocer's shop in Sussex. Following their retirement in the mid-1970s, they and Donald jointly bought a large house in Cooksbridge, about four miles outside Lewes in East Sussex, which they divided into two separate establishments. Donald experienced the estrangement from many of his parents' tastes and ideas common to the highly educated child of relatively poorly educated parents, but the emotional bond was close and enduring, never more in evidence than in the tender care for his mother's welfare that Donald displayed in the years between Sidney's death in 1993 and her own, at age 100, in 2015.

In an unpublished autobiographical account, Donald paints a subtly nuanced picture of his family's class position and of the education that moved him away from it (as well as a wry sketch of the vantage-point from which he now surveyed this

history, as 'a reasonably successful member of one of the shabbier branches of the professional middle-classes').[1] Already a clever boy at primary school, he was a beneficiary of the 11-plus system which won him a place at the nearby Sutton Grammar School. Writing half a century later, he could smile at the pretensions that survived from the school's more socially exclusive pre-1944 incarnation as well as at his own early antagonism to some of its more alien middle-class mores and snobberies. But, encouraged particularly by a sympathetic History teacher, he came in time to show more conscientiousness than belligerence (a dynamic or tension that remained visible throughout his career), and entered the sixth-form, a progression that was by no means to be taken for granted among children from his background at the time. He flourished in the intellectually stimulating and culturally rich environment of a 1950s grammar-school sixth-form, studying for A-levels in History, English, and Economics, while taking leading parts in debating, dramatic, and other school societies. His high marks qualified him for a State Studentship, which he chose to take up at LSE, attracted by its London location and its aura of engagement with the contemporary world. In October 1953 he embarked on the undergraduate course in Economics at 'the School' (as others, though rarely Donald, referred to it).

In later years, Donald retained a genuine respect for LSE, especially for the range and rigour of the syllabus he had to study, but he never quite seemed to have felt the affection and nostalgia that many others do for their *alma mater*. This may partly have been an expression of his cultivated briskness, even brusqueness, when talking about feelings and emotions, but it also owed something to the fact that he did not have the residential experience enjoyed by many students at other universities at the time. He commuted from the family home to the LSE on the Northern Line from Morden, or latterly on the back of a Vespa scooter owned by one of his fellow-students, and he retained his involvement with various local organisations and activities.

As an undergraduate, Donald responded to the intellectual stimulus of the diverse courses required in those days for the BSc(Econ) degree, especially classes in history and philosophy. Although it was not compulsory, he attended Michael Oakeshott's not-yet-famous lecture course on the history of political thought for two years in succession, seduced by its stylishness, intrigued by the subtlety of its textual and

[1] At some point in the mid-1990s, partly stimulated by reading Ralf Dahrendorf's history of the LSE, partly by having recently read John Burrow's autobiographical sketch of his early life, Donald wrote a two-part memoir entitled 'The London School of Economics and all that: I Getting there; II Being there'. In 2015–16 he wrote a further extended reflection on the making of his career entitled 'Intellectual history and the history of political economy'. He then attached the two LSE pieces as Appendixes to this account, subtitling the combined document 'Some autobiographical notes'. I quote from the continuously paginated version of this combined document: 'Some autobiographical notes', p. 85. An electronic copy forms part of the extensive collection of Donald's papers deposited at the University of Sussex archives in the East Sussex Record Office.

contextual analysis. But his focus was on economics, and within this field he discovered by his third year a special interest in international trade theory. The subject was taught by James Meade, later a Nobel-prize winner, and although their direct contact was limited and somewhat distant, Donald came to feel considerable estimation for Meade as one kind of model academic:

> The only time I met him outside the lecture hall at LSE was at a social event where he was pouring tea, rather bashfully, for members of his department. In later years I got to know a little more about him as a person – modest in manner, gentle, inventive, self-sufficient, almost saint-like in my estimation, if saints are allowed to be puckish. In retrospect, making use of my later trade as intellectual historian, I would say he was an archetypal representative of the best liberal socialist ideas of his day, with the emphasis falling on 'liberal' in one of its many senses. He was an admirable product of interwar, Second World War, and postwar economics, the period in which many of the intellectual foundations were laid for a world that his generation hoped would no longer be marred by heavy unemployment and large inequalities at home and economic autarky in international affairs.[2]

The hope of helping to make the world a better place had been a large part of the reason Donald had chosen to study Economics, but he also discovered in himself a more autonomous appetite for intellectual enquiry. It is true that he was (as he remained) on the left in the sense that he felt antagonistic to, even some disdain for, the old Tory establishment and the associated attitudes of snobbery and deference that it perpetuated, and he was, or at least longed to be, international in his outlook, irked by the parochialism of 1950s England. He had imbibed the secular progressive outlook that owed as much to, say, George Bernard Shaw or Aldous Huxley as to any more narrowly doctrinaire sources, and he had more than his share of the impatience common among clever young men. But as an undergraduate his development also started to take a more scholarly turn, experiencing a pleasure in ideas and their expression, even a taste for the hushed studiousness and sense of inheritance associated with great libraries.

In his final year he vaguely toyed with the idea of a career in one of the emerging international economic organisations, but when he was awarded a First he took up the opportunity provided by a Royal Insurance Company Fellowship to spend a year as a graduate student in the Economics Department at Princeton, where Meade's friend Jacob Viner taught international economics.[3] Donald distinguished himself in the first year graduate courses, thereby qualifying for funding that enabled him to stay and do

[2] Winch, 'LSE II: Being there', p. 133.

[3] Viner had published *Studies in the Theory of International Trade* in 1937 (London) before going on to the work in the history of economic thought for which he became better known, notably *The Long View and the Short: Studies in Economic Theory and Policy* (London, 1958).

a PhD, eventually submitted in 1960. Apart from international economics, the other graduate course that Viner taught was on the history of economic thought, and this encounter was to be decisive for the future direction of Donald's interests: 'Viner's course made some demanding assumptions about familiarity with the primary texts for an audience more accustomed to reading modern economic sources; but it also opened a window on the intricacies of textual interpretation that I was later to find enticing.'[4] For his dissertation, Donald tried to combine his interests in international economics with this new enthusiasm, following the thread of the export of capital and labour to the colonies in the nineteenth century, writing a dissertation somewhat cumbrously entitled 'The political economy of colonisation: a study in the development of the attitude of the English classical school to empire'. He later reflected that he must have been one of the last students at Princeton who had been permitted to do a dissertation on a subject in the history of economic thought, so rapidly was that ceasing to be regarded as a constituent element of the discipline as practiced in the leading US graduate schools (Viner retired in the year in which Donald submitted his dissertation). Donald subsequently wrote a sympathetic and moving memoir of Viner and, with Jacques Melitz, co-edited Viner's posthumous book *Religious Thought and Economic Society* (1978).[5] Curiously, Princeton was to be the scene of two of the major turning-points in Donald's intellectual life, the second coming some sixteen or seventeen years after the first.

Before he had submitted his dissertation, Donald obtained a one-year teaching post in the Economics department of the University of California at Berkeley (1959–60), and it must have seemed likely that he would make his career in the United States. American openness and energy spoke to him, especially at this stage of his life, and gave him a sense of freedom harder to come by in class-racked England. (The novels of David Lodge, Donald's exact contemporary, were memorably to capture this contrast, as Donald later recognised.) In 1957 he had married his long-standing English girlfriend, Marion Steed, who worked as a secretary in London, but even before the young couple moved to the West Coast it was clear that the marriage was in trouble. They separated during the year in Berkeley, something that may have encouraged Donald to think of returning to Britain. In 1960 he was appointed to a Lectureship in the Department of Political Economy at Edinburgh University.

[4] Winch, 'Some autobiographical notes', p. 13.

[5] D. Winch, 'Jacob Viner', *The American Scholar*, 50 (Autumn, 1981), 519–25; see also his 'Jacob Viner as intellectual historian', in W. J. Samuels (ed.), *The Craft of the Historian of Economic Thought* (Greenwich, CT, 1983), pp. 1–17.

Donald responded to the beauty and historical associations of Edinburgh without ever quite feeling at home in the still rather strait-laced academic society there. His first head of department, Alan Peacock, recognised the new recruit's talents and encouraged him in his interests, but some longer-established figures may have seemed less welcoming to the occasionally brash American-educated Englishman. Nonetheless, Donald's time at Edinburgh fostered his nascent interest in the Scottish traditions of political economy, an interest that had begun with his work on Adam Smith for his Princeton dissertation. In the early 1960s he was enlarging and extensively revising that work for publication, a project that led him to delve more deeply into the political and economic thinking of the early decades of the nineteenth century. The book was finally published in 1965 (under the auspices of the LSE), now more austerely titled *Classical Political Economy and Colonies*. Its Introduction quietly announced that it was a contribution to 'the history of ideas': it was not a study of policy-making, while 'at the same time it has been necessary to steer clear of the history of economic analysis for its own sake in order to remain close to the issues as seen by the participants. This study ... if it is to be classified, must be entered as a hybrid... .'[6] In his first academic publication, a polemical article entitled 'What price the history of economic thought?' in the *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* in 1962, Donald had already argued that the history of economic thought was becoming detached from the mainstream of the discipline, a development he resisted at the time, and his first monograph confirmed the historical turn in his own interests.[7] When the Scottish Economic Society inaugurated a short-lived series of editions of Scottish economic classics, Donald undertook the volume on James Mill's economic writings, and produced a substantial and learned edition that restored the elder Mill to his proper place among the classical economists; the book has lasted, being re-issued in 2006 and again in 2017.[8]

Having come to feel less comfortable in the Edinburgh department after the departure of Peacock to the founding chair at York, Donald took up a Lectureship in Economics at the University of Sussex in 1963. It was a fateful move: thereafter he spent his entire academic life at Sussex, becoming one of its most influential members and finding that, sometimes despite himself, much of his intellectual identity was bound up with the distinctiveness of the institution. The university, the earliest of the 'new' or 'plate-glass' universities founded in the 1960s, had taken its first fifty students

[6] D. Winch, *Classical Political Economy and Colonies* (London, 1965), p. 3. A Japanese translation was published in 1975.

[7] D. Winch, 'What price the history of economic thought?', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 9 (1962), 193–204.

[8] D. Winch (ed.), *James Mill: Selected Economic Writings* (Edinburgh, 1966; reprinted in 2006 by Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ, and in 2017 by Routledge, London).

in the autumn of 1961, and it was still tiny and unformed when Donald arrived. Part of the defining aspiration of the university was to break down the over-specialised character of English (though not Scottish) higher education: from the outset, it set its face against orthodox departments and single-subject degrees.[9] The principal organising units were the Schools: the humanities and social sciences were initially divided among the School of English and American Studies, the School of European Studies, and the School of Social Studies (soon re-named the School of Social Sciences). Cutting across these units were 'Subject-groups', which essentially reflected traditional disciplinary identities. So, for example, the History Subject-group could have members in more than one School, as could the Philosophy Subject-group, the Politics Subject-group, and so on. Undergraduates were admitted to a School, and approximately half their courses were 'contextuals', common courses provided for all students in that School whatever their 'major'; the rest of their courses were in their chosen major. This structure made for flexible but complex teaching loads for the academic staff. One might teach courses provided by one's Subject-group to students from more than one School, while at the same time one might teach a range of Contextual courses to students in one's home School who were taking a variety of different majors (and, in some cases, one might teach Contextual courses in other Schools). Both the ethos and the structure of the university favoured innovation. The Contextual courses, in particular, had to be designed to provide a common intellectual framework for students taking widely different majors, a form of provision for which there was no real precedent in English universities, though the University of Keele (founded in 1949 and obtaining full university status in 1962) had begun to break away from the single-subject template. The structure also encouraged 'team teaching', either in the form of a group of staff sharing responsibility for designing and teaching a Contextual course taken by large numbers, or in the form of two members of staff from different Subject-groups coming together to provide a course that was intended to meld the approaches and insights of two complementary disciplines (imaginative courses of this type in History and Literature were a notable local specialty).

A grasp of this educational structure is essential to understanding Donald's institutional role and, to some extent, his intellectual development.[10] His post was in the School of Social Studies and he quickly became involved in designing one of its most distinctive pedagogic innovations. The course, called 'Concepts, Methods, and Values in the Social Sciences' (or, more familiarly, 'CMV'), taken by all students in the School in their final year, was intended to provide a unifying understanding of both

[9] See D. Daiches (ed.), *The Idea of a New University: an Experiment in Sussex* (London, 1964).

[10] For further details see S. Collini, 'General introduction', in S. Collini, R. Whatmore, and B. Young (eds.), *Economy, Polity, and Society: British Intellectual History 1750–1950* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 1–21.

the philosophy and the history of the social sciences. In its earliest years, in the 1960s, Donald contributed to both parts of the course, throwing himself into teaching, say, Popper as well as Weber, but before long the two halves of the course acquired a semi-independent status, and Donald became the mainspring of the historical option.

The University of Sussex expanded very quickly in the 1960s: fifty undergraduates in 1961 became 400 in 1962 growing to 3,000 by 1968. Like any new university, it not only provided opportunities for curricular experiment but also for precocious career development. In 1968, at the early age of 33, Donald, already marked out by his energy, acumen and professional commitment, became Dean of the School of Social Sciences. It was not an auspicious year in which to occupy a senior administrative position at one of the universities in the forefront of student protests, and Donald's firm commitment to what he saw as core academic values did not always win him admirers from among the leaders of the insurgents. This was only the first of many occasions on which he engaged spiritedly on behalf of his conception of what a university was for, against attacks from both the right and the left, engagements that displayed his fearlessness, tactical adroitness, and natural pugnacity.

One of the more agreeable aspects of being a dean in an expanding new university was the influence it gave over creating and making new appointments. Having read with admiration John Burrow's first book, *Evolution and Society: a Study in Victorian Social Theory* (Cambridge, 1966), Donald invited John, then a lecturer in the School of European Studies at the University of East Anglia, to give a visiting lecture for CMV. That visit went well; both men held similar views about the need for a more historical understanding of the development of the social sciences; further correspondence ensued; finally, Donald engineered John's appointment to a post at Sussex in 1969. Although his title was to be 'Reader in History', his was not an appointment within the History Subject-group, which would have been the usual arrangement: it was a School appointment, specifically intended to support the teaching of the historical option of CMV. Thus began an association and a friendship that were to remain central to the lives of both men until John's death forty years later.

At much the same time, another piece of creative institutional entrepreneurship was taking place within the School of European Studies. Michael Moran, who had been appointed as a Lecturer in Philosophy in the School in its early years, found his interests in the history of ideas increasingly straying from, and at odds with, the style of analytic philosophy dominant at the time, and so he, together with a small group of colleagues similarly chafing at aspects of their disciplines' limits, such as Peter Burke in History and James Shiel in Classical and Medieval Studies, set up an MA in 'The History of Ideas'. The times were favourable to curricular experiment, enabling an undergraduate major in 'Intellectual History' to be established in 1969, based

initially in the School of European Studies, and subsequently offered also in English and American Studies. This was the first, and for a long time the only, degree-course to be so designated in a British university. John Burrow quickly became a member of the new Intellectual History subject-group. Donald was at this point still a member of the Economics subject-group, but he soon became a secondary member of Intellectual History and later offered courses within the major. More consequentially, the fortunes of the Intellectual History major and the historical option of CMV were henceforth to be closely entwined. In a period of expansion, it was possible to obtain funding for a further post, and in 1972 Larry Siedentop was appointed to the first Lectureship in Intellectual History, the post carrying explicit responsibilities for also teaching CMV. When Larry returned to Oxford after one year, the post was re-advertised with the same remit, and I took up the appointment from October 1974. Thus, by a series of historical accidents, and certainly not as a result of any governing design, the elements were now in place for the development of what was often referred to thereafter as 'the Sussex School' of intellectual history.

II

Donald's research and writing in the second half of the 1960s continued to be focused on the history of economic thought, particularly its influence on policy. Boldly, he switched his attention to the twentieth century and set about exploring aspects of very recent history. *Economics and Policy: a Historical Study* appeared in 1969, almost indecently soon after the events it analysed. It examined the influence of economic thinking, and more particularly of economists themselves as advisers, on public policy in Britain and United States. Though it ranged from the Edwardian age to the 1960s, the book largely concentrated on the period from the mid-1920s to the mid-1940s, constituting an oblique account of the 'Keynesian revolution' in both economic theory and policy. It charted the profound shift involved in coming to see macro-economic management as perhaps the prime task of governments, although it might be thought that the book, written before the counter-attack of neo-liberalism in the 1980s, expressed an unwarranted confidence that the Keynesian techniques of demand management were permanent political acquisitions. *Economics and Policy* did not attempt to uncover the inner history of policy formation and implementation (the fifty-year rule, as it then was, on the disclosure of official archives made that impossible), nor was it an internal history of the development of economic theory in the period. Its focus, and the sources upon which it drew most heavily, were forms of public debate, that hard-to-delimit terrain on which convictions about questions of policy are shaped only partly as a result of expert opinion.

Economics and Policy was a strikingly accomplished and confident performance by a scholar still in his thirties who had not been trained as a historian. Although Donald declared in the introduction that 'I have approached my subject very much as a historian rather than as one concerned with contemporary issues',[11] the book reflected the confidence of the 1960s that the nurturing of economic growth was now largely a matter of fine-tuning. In the preface to the paperback edition published two years later, he expressed some misgivings about the potentially whiggish implications of his concentration on the success of 'the Keynesian revolution', and in subsequent years he took a still greater distance from the book. The relaxation in 1967 of the embargo period for official archives to thirty years enabled Donald to re-visit aspects of the story in the light of newly released government documents, leading to the study, co-written with Susan Howson, of the role of the Economic Advisory Council during the years of financial crisis and depression around 1931.[12] This was a more formidably technical work than its predecessor, lacking some of the brio, chastened by the demands of detailed narrative reconstruction, yet still displaying a trademark mastery of economic ideas in their historical setting.

Two other roles from this period signalled Donald's continuing engagement with the wider community of economists. In 1968, he, together with the Belfast-based historian of economic thought, R. D. C. (Bob) Black, organised the first meeting (at Sussex) of colleagues in the UK with interests in the history of economics.[13] These informal gatherings flourished and grew, coming eventually to be formalised as the History of Economics Society. One of the group's most valuable and enduring enterprises, in the curating of which Donald took a leading part, was *Economists' Papers 1750-1950*, a guide to archival collections, now continued and updated on its own website.[14] The other role was more purely institutional yet at the same time became more deeply personal. In 1971, Austin Robinson asked Donald to become Publications Secretary of the Royal Economic Society, a post he went on to occupy for, remarkably, forty-five years. This was a role Donald took extremely seriously (but then he took all his roles seriously), investing large amounts of administrative time and scholarly labour in it. (Along the way he also served as reviews editor of the *Economic Journal* between 1976 and 1983.) He was principally responsible for the Society's

[11] D. Winch, *Economics and Policy: a Historical Study* (London, 1969 [pbk ed. London, 1972]), p. 29.

[12] D. Winch and S. Howson, *The Economic Advisory Council, 1930–1939: a Study in Economic Advice during Depression and Recovery* (Cambridge, 1976).

[13] Donald later wrote an appreciative memoir of Black, with whom he maintained a close professional friendship: D. Winch, 'R. D. Collison Black, 1922–2008: a personal tribute', *History of Political Economy*, 42 (2010), 1–17.

[14] See P. Sturges, *Economists' Papers 1750-1950: a Guide to Archive and other Manuscript Sources for the History of British and Irish Economic Thought* (London, 1975); http://www.economistspapers.org.uk/ (accessed 13 November 2019).

support of major editions of leading economists, including Malthus, Jevons, Marshall and Edgeworth, as well as for the stewardship and further development of the mammoth edition of the works of Keynes. He co-edited (with John Hey) *A Century of Economics: One Hundred Years of the Royal Economic Society and the Economic Journal*, which appeared in 1990 (Oxford) to mark the Royal Economic Society's centenary, and later he was to write the Introduction to a reissue of the Society's edition of John Maynard Keynes's *Essays in Biography*, published in 2010 (Basingstoke). Not all of Donald's colleagues on the Society's council in later years were sympathetic to these ventures ('philistines' was the most printable of his descriptions of them), opposition that mobilised his formidable reserves of determination, loyalty and belligerence.

Having completed his eventful tenure as Dean, Donald (who had been promoted to Reader in 1966 and Professor three years later) took a sabbatical year in 1974–5 at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, the scene for the second of those intellectual turning-points mentioned earlier. Although the first months of his fellowship were devoted to completing the book on the Economic Advisory Council, Donald's thinking was developing in new ways, spurred by conversation with others in Princeton, including Albert Hirschman among the permanent faculty and, especially, Quentin Skinner among the other visiting members that year. These conversations gave a sharper edge to his growing anti-whiggism and acquainted him with the recent work that had been undertaken in the history of political thought on the role of civic humanism and natural law in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Bringing the fruits of this new reading to his understanding of Adam Smith, itself enriched by advance access to the then forthcoming Glasgow edition of Smith's unpublished lectures on jurisprudence, Donald realised that Smith's purposes needed to be understood in much broader terms than those in which he was celebrated as 'the founder of Economics'. The impending approach in 1976 of the bicentenary of the publication of *The Wealth of Nations* gave these insights an added topicality, and Donald embarked on an intellectually daring and provocative enterprise: what if one took Adam Smith out of the teleological story that saw him as the founder of modern Economics, complete with its premises about the self-correcting operation of free markets, and returned him to an eighteenth-century, and specifically Scottish, context, seeing him as addressing concerns about 'the history of civil society', the contrasts between 'rude' and 'polished' nations, the dangers associated with the decline of 'the martial spirit', and so on? Donald had rightly perceived that both Smith's capitalist champions and his Marxist detractors shared an understanding of the character of Smith's most famous work: both groups saw it as essentially an analytical enquiry into how the operation of markets contributed to prosperity, the one group lauding this analysis, the other group condemning it. 'Admirers and critics of what Smith was held

to stand for ... were united in an unholy alliance not to disturb a stereotype that had become a necessary one for articulating both liberal and anti-liberal positions.'[15] In place of the stereotype, Donald recovered a Smith for whom 'the science of the legislator' was the over-arching intellectual enterprise, an author needing to be viewed alongside such Scottish peers as Francis Hutcheson and David Hume, and an active participant in topical disputes over such questions as the role of a citizen militia or the rights and wrongs of the rebellion in the American colonies.

Adam Smith's Politics: an Essay in Historiographic Revision was published in 1978 (Cambridge). The sub-title was exact: the short book was, in one sense of the term, an 'essay', not aspiring to comprehensiveness or a continuous narrative. It was, in effect, a sustained piece of argument, directed principally against those who had understood Smith through the lens of a later, market-based understanding of economics. The book made an immediate impact and was widely discussed: economists, in particular, did not always smile on it, but its central claims were irrefutable, and it has come to be seen as a foundational contribution to the enlarged and historically more sophisticated understanding of Smith that has developed in recent decades. Subsequent reprintings and translations of the book testify to its continuing influence.[16]

Upon his return from leave in 1975, Donald, now freed from major administrative duties and fired up by his recent engagement with eighteenth-century intellectual history, threw himself not just into the teaching of CMV but also into ideas for forms of publication that might express and vindicate the historical approach to the past of the social sciences embodied in that course. Over the years, he and John Burrow had fitfully tried to talk each other into some joint writing project, but without ever getting beyond the stage of sketching ambitious ideas over drinks. In the mid- and late 1970s I started to contribute to both the ideas and the drinks, and slowly we began to persuade ourselves that, improbably, we really could write a book together. A lot of ideas were aired and discarded (and a lot of drinks consumed) before we settled on the eventual shape of the book that was published in 1983 as *That Noble Science of Politics: a Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History*.

Although the chapters of the book grew out of collective discussion and were subject to collective revision, the majority of them were in the first instance drafted by a single author. In this way, Donald was responsible for the first three chapters (or 'essays' as we more fastidiously liked to term them) covering the very late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, especially debates centring around the work of figures such as Dugald Stewart, Robert Malthus and James Mill. Donald and I co-wrote the

[15] Winch, 'Some autobiographical notes', p. 68.

[16] The book was last re-issued, with corrections, in 2008; it was translated into Japanese, with new introduction, 1989; Italian 1992; Chinese 2008.

chapter on Alfred Marshall, a singularly happy and conflict-free experience of collaboration in which it genuinely would be difficult to distinguish our separate contributions. All three authors had a hand in the occasionally polemical 'Prologue', which came to be cited as something of an anti-whiggish manifesto for its incitement to attend to what gets lost when the intellectual life of the past is divided up as the property of later academic disciplines. The briefest way to indicate the character of the book is to quote the following passage from the Preface, written in 1996, for the Japanese translation:

> As the Prologue to the book was intended to make clear, some of the intellectual energy that fuelled its writing came from our shared negative reaction to certain prevailing disciplinary dispensations. Most obviously, we repudiated those forms of 'the history of the social sciences' which consisted in finding 'precursors' and 'founding fathers' for contemporary social scientific specialisms from among past writers the specificity and integrity of whose concerns had thereby come in for some very rough treatment indeed. Our shared experience over several years of teaching 'The Historical Development of the Social Sciences' course at Sussex had left us dissatisfied with, in particular, the way eighteenth- and nineteenth-century concerns were treated in literature of this kind. Not only was there a tendency to bypass the political dimension of past thinking, but when that dimension was recognised it was treated reductively, either as mere party politics or as an aspect of a set of ideological allegiances, many of which would either have been rejected or unrecognisable to our chosen cast of authors. We also repudiated the coerciveness of the priorities encouraged by 'the history of political theory', an enterprise which has enjoyed such a strong institutional position in the Anglo-American scholarly world that political, economic, and social historians all too easily take it to *be* intellectual history. And, more obviously, we took our distance from those kinds of approaches which are united in little else than in assuming that intellectual activity is best understood as a reflection or by-product of some allegedly more fundamental social or economic process.[17]

The book explored a series of attempts by nineteenth-century authors to develop systematic knowledge of 'things political', that encompassing ancient category which covered enquiries later sub-divided among Political Science, Sociology, Economics and so on. The selection of figures for discussion paid little heed to subsequent forms of canonisation as 'founding fathers'—Dugald Stewart and Walter Bagehot received their due; E. A. Freeman was in his proper place alongside Sir Henry Maine; Henry Sidgwick was accorded no less attention than Alfred Marshall; and the treatment was deliberately episodic and discontinuous, tactics intended to disrupt residual teleological

[17] S. Collini, D. Winch and J. Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics: a Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History* (Cambridge, 1983); the Japanese translation was eventually published by Minerva, Tokyo, in 2005. The Preface to that translation was never published in English, though the above passage was also quoted in Collini, Whatmore and Young, *Economy, Polity, and Society*, p. 10.

expectations. Although the book was widely reviewed—far more widely than would be the case for a comparable publication today—and on the whole very favourably, it was hardly surprising that some reviewers expressed bafflement or irritation with these features. As one reviewer sympathetically put it: 'This is going to be a perplexing book for many. Librarians will wonder how to classify it. Specialists in politics and economics will be embarrassed at its demonstration of how what they thought sewn up can be unstitched. Tutors will wonder what passages their pupils can be trusted not to misunderstand.'[18]

Camping up the submission of our separate identities to the collective enterprise, we christened ourselves 'Burrinchini' and decided not to take the royalties (such as they were) individually, but to put them in a fund that was to be used to finance an annual reunion dinner of considerable extravagance. These dinners, which usually took place at Donald's house in Cooksbridge, were not for the faint-hearted, or at least not for the weak-livered, and after a couple of decades we had ruefully to recognise that the health of the fund was now considerably better than that of the authors. Thereafter, the residual monies were, at Donald's suggestion, used to subsidise activities associated with Intellectual History at Sussex.

Donald's contribution to *That Noble Science* signalled what were to be his principal preoccupations during the ensuing decade: on the one hand the question of the fate of Smith's ambitious programme in the hands of various putative successors, and, on the other, what was to prove a long engagement with the work and reputation of Robert Malthus. The former issued in several essays in the 1980s and early 1990s, studies that were never merely re-statements of a now-familiar case but always attempts to explore fresh ramifications of the re-orientation of the interpretation of Smith that Donald had done so much to stimulate.[19] The latter was a less predictable direction for his interests to have taken and requires a little more explanation.

[18] W. Thomas, 'Review of *That Noble Science of Politics*', *English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), 702–4.

[19] D. Winch, 'Adam Smith's enduring particular result; a political and cosmopolitan perspective', in I. Hont and M. Ignatieff (eds.), *Wealth and Virtue: the Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 253–69; D. Winch, 'Adam Smith als politischer Theoretiker', in F. X. Kaufmann (ed.), *Markt, Staat und Solidarität bei Adam Smith* (Frankfurt, 1984), pp. 95–113; D. Winch, 'Science and the legislator: Adam Smith and after', *Economic Journal*, 93 (1983), 501–20 (reprinted in P. Roggi (ed.), *Gli economisti e la politica economia*, Edizione Scientifiche Italiane, 1985, pp. 81–107); D. Winch, 'The Burke-Smith problem in late eighteenth-century political and economic thought', *Historical Journal*, 28 (1985), 231–47; D. Winch, 'Adam Smith and the liberal tradition', in K. Haakonssen (ed.), *Traditions of Liberalism; Essays on John Locke, Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill* (Sydney, 1988), pp. 83–101, reprinted in K. Haakonssen (ed.), *Adam Smith* (International Library of Critical Essays in the History of Philosophy) (Aldershot, and Brookfield, VT, 1998); D. Winch, 'Adam Smith's politics revisited', *Quaderni di Storia dell'Economia Politica*, 9 (1991), 3–27; and D. Winch, 'Adam Smith: Scottish moral philosopher as political economist', *Historical Journal*, 35 (1992), 91–113, reprinted in Haakonssen, *Adam Smith*.

The second chapter of *That Noble Science*, 'Higher Maxims', had taken its title from a passage by Francis Horner, a pupil of Dugald Stewart and one of the first 'Edinburgh reviewers', who wrote: 'The truths of political economy form but a class among the principles of administration, and in their practical application must often be limited by higher maxims of state, to which in theory too they are held subordinate, as being less general.'[20] In his friendly exchanges and theoretical disputes with Ricardo, Malthus had in effect attempted to develop a form of political economy that could do justice to the truth of Horner's observation and provide the basis for those 'higher maxims'. This enterprise appealed to Donald at several levels, not least because it opened up a way of attending to the political and economic debates of the first three decades of the nineteenth century in ways that did not give centre-stage to ideas that later economists identified as precursors of their own. Although Donald certainly did not share Malthus's Anglican moralism, he warmed to his dogged, unfashionable attacks on unbridled optimism about human progress, and he wanted to do justice to a body of work that was too often pilloried as a simplistic misunderstanding of the consequences of population growth. His exemplary short study of Malthus for the Oxford University Press 'Past Masters' series, published in 1987, was the chief expression of this engagement, followed by his edition of Malthus's *An Essay on the Principle of Population* for the Cambridge University Press 'Texts in the History of Political Thought' series in 1992.[21] In addition, he published several important essays on aspects of Malthus's work and legacy, and was to return to him in greater detail in his 1996 book *Riches and Poverty*.[22] In his capacity as Publications Secretary of the Royal Economics Society he also sponsored and helped to see into print the major scholarly editions of Malthus's *Essay* and of his *Principles of Political Economy*, edited respectively by Patricia James and J. M. Pullen, two scholars whose close and detailed work he admired.

[20] Francis Horner, quoted in 'Higher maxims: happiness versus wealth in Malthus and Ricardo', in Collini, Winch and Burrow, *That Noble Science*, p. 63.

[21] The 'Past Masters' volume was reprinted in *Great Economists* (Oxford, 1997), with a foreword by Keith Thomas; an updated version appeared as part of Oxford University Press's 'Very Short Introduction' series in 2013. It was published in Japanese translation in 1992.

[22] D. Winch 'Robert Malthus: Christian moral scientist, arch-demoralizer, or implicit secular utilitarian?', *Utilitas*, 5 (1993), 239–53; D. Winch, 'Malthus versus Condorcet revisited', *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 3 (1996), 45–62; D. Winch, 'The reappraisal of Malthus', *History of Political Economy*, 30 (1998), 60–72.

III

Donald had a highly developed sense of academic duty, one that put more selfish or more casual colleagues to shame. In 1986 he yielded, without enthusiasm, to the entreaties of others at Sussex who wanted him to take on the role of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Arts and Social Sciences), in which capacity he served for three years. Being effectively the most senior figure on the non-scientific side of the university during the belt-tightening years of the later 1980s was never going to be a comfortable position, one that was not made easier by the appointment of Sir Leslie Fielding, a former diplomat, as Vice-Chancellor in 1987. Donald found Fielding's managerial style simultaneously high-handed and inattentive, more concerned with appearances than with reality, and the two clashed on several occasions. Donald always had a strong attachment to a traditional conception of a university as an institution committed to unfettered, open-ended enquiry, underpinned by the most rigorous standards of scholarship and science. But the times were requiring universities to be more immediately instrumental in their purposes and less demanding in their standards, pressures that Donald did his best to resist, a lonely and oftentimes thankless task. He was an extremely capable administrator, and no one could ever doubt his commitment to the welfare of the university or the demands he made upon himself, but he could on occasion be growly and impatient, characteristics that did not always endear him to colleagues who found themselves on the other side of an argument. His dismay at the direction taken by Sussex in particular and universities in general from the 1980s onwards was partially offset by Fellowship of the British Academy, an institution whose scholarly rationale he could endorse without reservation. He was an active Fellow following his election in 1986, serving with distinction as Vice-President in 1993–4, and as a valued and long-serving member of the Academy's Publications Committee (1990–9); he also co-edited (with Patrick O'Brien) *The Political Economy of British Historical Experience, 1688–1914*, which appeared in 2002, part of the Academy's centenary celebrations.[23] As a mark of his attachment, he left the Academy a substantial bequest to finance a Senior Research Fellowship in Intellectual History.

Donald was himself a beneficiary of one of these enlightened schemes for providing established academics with a little space in which to think and write when he was awarded a two-year British Academy Readership in 1993. This enabled him to extend

[23] Personal and institutional loyalties came together in Donald's last published piece of research, an exploration of Keynes's initial exclusion from, and subsequent role within, the Academy: D. Winch, 'Keynes and the British Academy', *Historical Journal,* 57 (2014), 751–71. A shorter version of this was published in *British Academy Review*, 22 (Summer 2013), 70–4.

his enquiries about Smith and Malthus into a much more ambitious undertaking. It can be unwise to dignify as a 'magnum opus' one work (or pair of works) by an author who continued to develop intellectually in the way that Donald did, but there can be no doubt that *Riches and Poverty: an Intellectual History of Political Economy in Britain, 1750-1834*, which appeared in 1996, and its sequel *Wealth and Life: Essays on the Intellectual History of Political Economy in Britain, 1848-1914*, published in 2009, constitute his most weighty as well as, it seems safe to say, enduring contributions to scholarship.

Building on his earlier re-situating of *The Wealth of Nations* within Smith's larger project of 'the science of the legislator', *Riches and Poverty* now asked what became of this project, both in the later years of Smith's career and in the hands of the next couple of generations of successors and critics. 'After Adam Smith' was one rejected title for the book (it was used for the Prologue instead), as was 'The Secret Concatenation', taken from Dr Johnson's observation about the links between luxury and poverty (this was the title Donald gave to his Carlyle lectures at Oxford), and each of these signals something about the eventual character of the book. But it is as much a history of political thought in the period as of anything later understood as 'economics'. Burke is scarcely a less central figure than Smith, while Ricardo's theorising is more than offset by the polemical contributions of the likes of Paine, Priestley and Price.[24] Malthus, the third central figure, is treated as a 'political moralist' for whom strictly economic questions were always subordinate to Christian imperatives, while Coleridge and Southey receive more detailed treatment than do some of the 'projectors' and 'calculators' whom they attacked.

One of the book's quiet achievements is the demonstration of how inseparable his protagonists' main ideas were from the more quotidian forms of political debate. This is most strikingly true of his account of the friendly controversies and exchanges between Ricardo and Malthus, where theoretical differences over large questions about value, land, currency and so on are shown to have grown piecemeal from other, more local differences over policy during the Napoleonic Wars or proposals for poor relief (he always had a high regard for, and duly acknowledged, the work of Boyd Hilton in this area). More generally, the book proceeds through the exploration of relations of 'affinity and discord' among figures normally categorised in other terms, with only occasional explicit condemnation of those later scholars who might have allowed some anachronistic category, whether capitalist or Marxist in inspiration, to

[24] Donald later extended his discussion of James Mackintosh, who had only received passing treatment in D. Winch, *Riches and Poverty: an Intellectual History of Political Economy in Britain, 1750-1834* (Cambridge, 1996), in the introduction to his edition of James Mackintosh, *Vindiciae Gallicae and Other Writings on the French Revolution* (Indianapolis, IN, 2006).

cloud their vision.[25] As Keith Tribe summarised the book's impact, it 'reorients our understanding of the origins of classical economics in a quite decisive manner'.[26]

Ideally, one should be able to exhibit Donald's prose at work rather than attempting to describe its characteristics, but it is not easy to excerpt briefly since his writing produced its effects by means of a kind of sustained command.[27] The following passage is simply one of dozens which display the book's incisive grasp of the choreography of intellectual alliance and antagonism as it introduces a discussion of the relations between the ideas of Smith, Burke, Paine,and Price at the end of the eighteenth century. Having remarked that Burke 'suggested the possibility of an inversion of the more familiar sequence expounded by Hume, Smith, and other Scottish historians of civil society, whereby commerce brings an improvement in manners and the arts and sciences in its train', Donald proceeds in characteristic fashion to allow historical complexity to erode the simplicities of later stereotypes:

> Paine's extrapolation of the more widely accepted sequence into the future, however, and the welcome given to Smith's system of natural liberty by other contemporary opponents of Burke, has proved as useful to students of turn-of-the-century radicalism as it has to students of what later was seen as Burke's conservatism. In Paine's case, it has allowed him to be characterised as a spokesman for an upwardly mobile society of self-interested economic individualists, as the radical embodiment of all those 'bourgeois' qualities that Smith, alongside and in harmony with Locke, is supposed to represent [a footnote hauls a selection of eminent miscreants into the dock at this point]. As in the case of Burke, some of the resulting characterisations have had an homogenising effect on the diverse qualities of radicalism in this period. Including Price alongside Paine in this comparative exercise acts as a reminder that supporters of revolution did not always speak with the same voice when diagnosing the economic conditions most likely to consort with republican institutions. Price did not fully share Paine's 'Smithian' confidence in the progressive potential contained in the spread of commerce and manufacturing. Nor, as we shall see, did Smith share Paine's belief in the capacity or necessity for commerce to civilise by revolutionising government.[28]

The passage is in some ways a promissory note, one made good by the rest of the chapter from the opening paragraphs of which it is taken. It is, typically, argumentative, and it is revisionist in the way complex, freshly-seen history is always revisionist, in refusing the mind any easy resting-place in familiar modern categories. The chapter

[25] Winch, *Riches and Poverty*, p. 10.
[26] K. Tribe, 'Donald Winch 1935–2017', *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 25 (2018), 200.
[27] This paragraph is adapted from S. Collini, 'General Introduction' to *Economy, Polity, and Society*, pp. 17–18.
[28] Winch, *Riches and Poverty*, p. 131.

is entitled 'Contested Affinities', a phrase emblematic of Donald's address to intellectual history, with its constant attempt to do justice both to family resemblances and to family quarrels. As in the book as a whole, the very structure of the prose vetoes any slack assimilation of what were subtly different positions, yet a clarity of outline survives through all attention to idiosyncrasy.

A variety of other tasks and distractions slowed the completion of the work that Donald always intended as a sequel to *Riches and Poverty*, with the result that *Wealth and Life* did not appear until thirteen years later. By modestly describing the book as 'essays', Donald may have contributed to a tendency to undervalue it as an original work of scholarship: without fanfare, it excavates a variety of overlooked or misunderstood debates from the period and is based on an exceptionally wide range of sources, including no fewer than sixteen archival collections, some previously little known or little used. Alongside such usual suspects as Mill, Jevons and Marshall, a large cast of characters come in for quite detailed discussion, including Bagehot, Cairnes, Cliffe Leslie, Cunningham, Fawcett, Foxwell, Hobson, J. N. Keynes, Mallet, Sidgwick and Toynbee among those with some claim to have contributed as economists, together with a still larger cast of critics and commentators including Carlyle, Cobden, Dickens, Henry George, Maine, Ruskin and the Webbs. The book deliberately refuses several of the familiar organising binaries. Referring to Toynbee's phrase about the 'bitter argument between economists and human beings', it exposes the fallacy involved in assigning concern with 'life' as opposed to 'wealth' exclusively to the side of the 'human beings': such broader issues were at the heart of economic thinking in this period, so that 'in the continuing debates over wealth and life no one group had an exclusive monopoly of either category'.[29] Nor does it tell a story of 'classical political economy' giving way to 'neo-classical economics' as a result of the so-called marginalist revolution: struggles with the legacy of Mill's *Principles*, attempts to clarify the notion of 'value', and insistence on the practical applicability of their science united figures whom the conventional story would assign to opposing schools. It should also be said that practically none of the figures whom Donald discusses in *Wealth and Life* exhibited that dogmatic adherence to the principle of *laissez-faire* which critics of the dismal science alleged to be characteristic of its exponents. The most telling chapter in this respect is the wonderfully intricate unravelling of Sidgwick's careful depositions in favour of 'economic socialism' in cases where his fundamental individualist principle could not operate successfully, a chapter which pays generous

[29] D. Winch, *Wealth and Life: Essays on the Intellectual History of Political Economy in Britain, 1848–1914* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 366. He administered a particularly sharp reproach to E. P. Thompson on this score, but then Thompson was a figure to whom Donald, provoked by some of Thompson's more high-handed ideological classifications, never quite did justice. See, in particular, the Appendix on 'Mr Gradgrind and Jerusalem', pp. 367–98.

tribute to Sidgwick's perspicuity at the same time as it indulges a wry smile at his laborious caution. And, finally, the book does not allow an easy distinction between 'academic' and 'non-academic' writers to structure the story: several figures straddled or crossed this supposed divide which was anyway less clear-cut in a period before fully self-sustaining academic careers became the norm. Although the book never makes this connection, one can even see its final chapters coming full circle to Donald's much earlier book, *Economics and Policy*, in that they explore some of the tensions involved in the earliest attempts by academic economists to deploy their scholarly authority on the contested terrain of policy-formation. But the connection also underlines just how far Donald had travelled intellectually in the intervening forty years. *Wealth and Life* is a more nuanced, thickly textured, piece of scholarship, one that is alive to the religious, philosophical, and cultural dimensions of his cast's thinking in ways that the earlier study, focused on the interplay of economic theory and economic policy, had not been.

Structurally, Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, published in 1848, occupies something of the position in this book that Smith's *Wealth of Nations* did in its predecessor, the *summa* which subsequent generations imbibed, refined, and criticised. But even while taking this much-studied figure as his starting-point, Donald managed to offer an original perspective. The chapter entitled 'Wild natural beauty, the religion of humanity, and unearned increments' explored what might now be termed Mill's 'environmental' thinking, ingeniously weaving together 'the stationary state', the moral influence of natural beauty, commons preservation, 'peasant proprietorship', and Land Tenure Reform—a selection of Mill's enthusiasms that were united in their insistence on the centrality of nature and human rootedness in the land, commitments that were far removed from the stereotype of the 'desiccated calculating machine' and apologist for *laissez-faire*. This excavation of the deeper cultural and even sometimes temperamental sources of perspectives on supposedly 'economic' questions is a hallmark of the book. As it says of one of the most familiar and hackneyed transitions in economic theorising: 'While there can be no doubt about the nature of Jevons's disagreement with Mill's political economy on this issue [sc. the theory of value], what the essay on him here tries to show is that Jevons's antipathy to Mill had deeper philosophical and religious roots.'[30] Donald elaborated this case in more programmatic terms in one of the most important of his later articles, teasingly entitled (adapting Marshall) 'The Old Generation of Economists and the New; an intellectual historian's approach to a significant transition'.[31]

[30] Winch, *Wealth and Life*, p. 21.

[31] D. Winch, 'The old generation of economists and the new; an intellectual historian's approach to a significant transition', *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 32 (2010), 23–37.

That article was the text of an invited lecture to the annual gathering of the History of Economics Society, of which he had been elected a Distinguished Fellow in 2007. Other tributes to his standing included being made an Honorary Member of the European Society for the History of Economic Thought in 2012 and being the subject of a chapter in Medema and Samuels, *Historians of Economics and Economic Thought*, while even the lengthy but bizarrely wrong-headed critique by Gregory C. G. Moore was back-handed testament to the eminence he had now achieved.[32] Since his death, there have been several admiring and heartfelt assessments of the figure described as 'one of the most inspirational intellectual historians of our time'.[33]

IV

In 1983 Donald married Doreen ('Dolly') Lidster, who taught the history of art, and over the remaining thirty-four years of his life he found a settled domestic happiness that had hitherto eluded him. Dolly's sociability and adaptability softened Donald's occasional tendency to irascible withdrawal, leading the Old Brewery, their house in Cooksbridge, to become the scene of countless high-spirited gatherings. She also did more than her share in helping and later caring for Donald's parents, as well as contributing hours of labour to the maintenance of the garden— though 'grounds' seems a more appropriate term for the four and a half acre plot at the foot of the Downs that Donald turned into a lush, bosky, many-roomed English garden in the Romantic tradition (charming nooks, seductive vistas, little regularity). His responsiveness to the natural world expressed itself in sometimes surprising ways, ranging from his discriminating judgements about several of the famous country-house gardens to, perhaps, that sympathetic responsiveness to the importance of environmental concerns in John Stuart Mill's social thought.Dolly also accompanied him on many of his academic travels, beginning their married life with a rather daunting year spent largely in Canberra, New Orleans and Calgary where Donald had visiting appointments. These were followed in later years by an extended visit to Japan (where he was particularly celebrated for his work on Malthus), numerous lecturing trips in Europe, and a

[32] G. Gilbert, 'Donald Winch as intellectual historian', in S. G. Medema and W. J. Samuels (eds.), *Historians of Economics and Economic Thought* (London, 2001); G. C .G. Moore, 'Placing Donald Winch in context: an essay on *Wealth and Life*', *History of Economics Review*, 52 (2010), 77–108.

[33] M. Albertone and E. Pasini, 'Editorial: homage to Donald Winch', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History of Ideas*, 6 (2017). See also Tribe, 'Donald Winch 1935–2017', 196–201; J. Stapleton and D. P. O'Brien, 'Professor Donald Norman Winch 1935–2017', *History of Political Economy*, 50 (2018), 421–4; S. Howson, 'Donald Winch (15 April 1935–12 June 2017)', *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 28 (2017), 565–8.

Visiting Fellowship at All Souls in Oxford in 1994. Much of the substance of the Carlyle Lectures in the History of Political Thought he gave at Oxford in 1995 was taken from *Riches and Poverty*, to be published the following year, but the six-lecture format led him to adopt a rather different perspective. The full text of the lectures is now available on the Intellectual History website at the University of St Andrews.[34]

Donald officially retired from Sussex in 2000. As he observed in a farewell speech: 'It has to be said that Sussex is not the kind of institution in which it is easy to grow old gracefully, to fade away from, as old soldiers are said to do. One reason for going now is to avoid growing old disgracefully, of becoming a gargoyle in buildings that were never designed for such things.'[35] But he cared too deeply about the fate of Intellectual History in the university to absent himself entirely, and having played an active part in the appointment of Knud Haakonssen to the Chair in Intellectual History in 2005 (in succession to Martin van Gelderen, who had succeeded John Burrow), he then gave Knud and Richard Whatmore much practical and moral support in their resourceful attempts to make the Sussex Centre for Intellectual History a flourishing hive of research activity—attempts which were impressively successful before being undermined by official obtuseness and indifference. Sussex had meant so much to Donald for so long; his understandable resentments about the behaviour of the university's 'senior management team' in his final years should not be allowed altogether to efface the loyalty and commitment to his conception of that institution's best self that had animated him over the decades. This and his scholarly eminence were recognised in an unusual way when he was awarded an honorary degree by his own university in 2006. In a moving speech of acceptance he recalled having deprived his parents of an important pleasure by heedlessly skipping his graduation ceremony at the LSE half-a-century earlier, emphasising the corresponding satisfaction it gave him to be able to make partial amends by having his 92-year-old mother present on this occasion.

For someone who was involved in so many collaborative enterprises, institutional and intellectual, and who had such a gift for close friendship, Donald lived a strikingly solitary academic existence for much of his life, largely spent in his small, smoke-suffused study at home in Cooksbridge rather than in any more sociable setting. But, a little like a member of the republic of letters from an earlier century, he stayed in touch with an extensive network of other scholars by means of a genre at which he excelled and which he cultivated with deliberate, unfashionable punctiliousness: the

[34] https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/intellectualhistory/islandora/object/intellectual-history%3A27 (accessed 12 November 2019).

[35] D. Winch, 'End', a typescript written in the late 1990s, p. 7; a copy is included in the Winch Papers, Sussex Archives.

extended exchange of letters on serious intellectual and scholarly matters. As he wrote in his autobiographical reflections: 'While it is reassuring to have sympathetic colleagues living in the same corridor or building, I have always found my real and ideal university through correspondence with like-minded people living elsewhere, usually abroad.'[36] His exchanges with other scholars of the eighteenth century such as Duncan Forbes and J. G. A. Pocock are models of intellectual engagement. The boxes of letters now deposited with his papers only include an occasional sample of his side of such exchanges, but anyone whose intellectual path crossed Donald's will testify to his striking attentiveness and generosity in this medium. As a reader of draft typescripts, he was thorough, sympathetic and meticulous; he was notably helpful to a number of younger scholars in this way, giving them the kind of informed, detailed, critical reading of their work which in some cases they had never encountered before. In addition, his files of letters on various contested matters of business would send a shiver down the spine of anyone in a position of administrative or bureaucratic responsibility—forensic, commanding, with a terrier-like determination not to let go till his correspondent ('adversary' seems more apt in some cases) dropped the bone or ran up the white flag. One of his favoured terms of disapprobation was 'slack': correspondents who did not reply as fully or promptly as Donald felt the situation demanded were prone to be classified as 'slack', an exasperated judgement to which he could impart an almost Old Testament damningness.

Though his published writing is measured and precise, Donald was a man of strong attachments and deep feelings, emotions sometimes masked from public view by a cultivated gruffness. As a friend—and he sustained numerous close friendships over many decades—he was wonderfully steadfast and unabashedly partisan, but also enormous fun. To sit up late over the whisky with him was a sure route to ever-greater affection and admiration as well as to a terrible hangover. In public settings he could sometimes appear rather formidable, but in the company of close friends he could be an engagingly expressive contributor to any gathering, responsive and appreciative rather than merely performative. He could also be a quite hilarious, pitch-perfect mimic. To hear him, for example, 'doing' a Glasgow taxi-driver on the theoretical defects of monetarism was to believe that Billy Connolly had a rival. And I remember thinking, after one rendition of the mechanic who failed to mend his car in Canberra, that Donald had been lucky to get out of Australia alive.

He was counter-suggestibly proud of the fact that he had never succumbed to any fashionable concern for his health or for 'staying in shape'. His eating, drinking, and, for many years, smoking habits ensured he could never be accused of 'looking after himself', yet until late in his life he retained remarkable physical strength, engaging

[36] Winch, 'Some autobiographical notes', p. 33.

with Gladstonian vigour in the felling and removing of surplus trees from his garden. But eventually his way of life caught up with him, involving unpleasant procedures to deal with growths on his bladder, operations to insert stents in his heart and medication for diabetes and for gout. Finally, he was diagnosed with lung cancer, which in his last months then spread to his brain. Donald had long admired the philosophic calm with which one of his heroes, David Hume, faced his own impending death. In everyday life, Donald didn't exactly *do* philosophic calm: his own dealings with circumstance always had a rather more combative edge to them. But as I think anyone would testify who saw him during those last dreadful eighteen months when even *his* ox-like constitution began to fail him, he displayed a quite remarkable dignity and stoicism in the face of the humiliations of dissolution.

The last time I saw Donald at the Old Brewery, not long before he was moved into the hospice where he was so well cared for in his final days, he was already much weakened and sleeping quite a lot. But he would make an effort to rouse himself for the rare visitor and, after the usual convivial dinner, he and I found ourselves sitting alone over the whisky at the evening's end, as we had done so often during the previous four decades. With the importunity permitted to an old friend, I asked him about his state of mind. 'Well', he said, reflectively but without either resentment or anguish, 'one can't, of course, imagine not being here, but, as the moment approaches, one just hopes to make a more or less orderly exit.' There was much of the man in that undemonstrative English idiom, and it requires no further commentary. But it does still seem unbearably difficult to adjust to his 'not being here', so large and central and loved a presence was he in so many lives.

Acknowledgements
Except where indicated, this memoir draws on personal knowledge and on the substantial cache of Donald's papers and digital archives in my possession. A much larger deposit of his papers, fully catalogued, is now available in the University of Sussex archives at the East Sussex Record Office. Further information, and the texts of some of his unpublished lectures, are available from the Intellectual History website at the University of St Andrews. For comments on earlier drafts of this memoir, I am grateful to Roger Backhouse, Peter Clarke, Knud Haakonssen, Boyd Hilton, Helen Small and John Thompson; special thanks are due to Dolly Winch.

Note on the author: Stefan Collini is Emeritus Professor of Intellectual History and English Literature, University of Cambridge. He was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 2000.