Alan Macfarlane's Challenge to Douglass North and New Institutional Economics

Heng-Fu Zou (IAS, Wuhan University)

December 2, 2024

Abstract

Alan Macfarlane's research challenges the dominant theories of Douglass North, New Institutional Economics, Max Weber, and Karl Marx on the origins of capitalism. He demonstrates that capitalism in England emerged not through institutional reforms, Protestant ethics, or class struggles but from unique cultural, legal, and social developments rooted in the 11th to 13th centuries. Macfarlane emphasizes the role of individualism, the common law system, and market-oriented practices, which predated formal reforms. His critique exposes the limitations of universalist and deterministic frameworks, reframing capitalism's rise as a historically contingent process shaped by England's specific cultural and historical context.

1 Introduction

Alan Macfarlane's groundbreaking research into the historical development of capitalism fundamentally challenges traditional narratives that place its origins in the Renaissance or the Industrial Revolution. Instead, Macfarlane traces the roots of capitalism to the 11th to 13th centuries in England. His works, including The Origins of English Individualism, The Culture of Capitalism, The Making of the Modern World, and The Invention of the Modern World, argue that England's unique legal, social, and economic structures provided the conditions for the early emergence of bourgeois institutions and the capitalist ethos. Through a detailed exploration of individualism, property rights, legal innovations, and social organization, Macfarlane reshapes our understanding of England's historical trajectory and its role as the birthplace of modern capitalism.

A central pillar of Macfarlane's argument is the emphasis on individual property ownership, which he identifies as a defining feature of English society from as early as the 11th century. Unlike much of Europe, where collective family holdings and feudal obligations dominated, England embraced a system of private property. This system allowed individuals to own, transfer, and inherit land with minimal interference, fostering economic independence. Legal frameworks, particularly the development of common law under Henry II, reinforced this by protecting property rights and emphasizing the sanctity of contracts. Innovations such as "fee simple" ownership enabled land to be freely transferred, creating a vibrant land market that encouraged individual enterprise and long-term investment.

The economic implications of this system were profound. By the 13th century, English agriculture had become increasingly commercialized, with farmers producing surplus goods for sale in expanding local and regional markets. Unlike the rigid manorial systems prevalent on the continent, which often tied peasants to the land, English agrarian practices allowed for greater mobility and economic freedom. These practices not only improved productivity but also laid the foundation for a dynamic and entrepreneurial rural economy. This emphasis on individual property and economic agency was integral to the rise of capitalist enterprise in England.

Macfarlane also highlights the critical role of the nuclear family structure in medieval England's economic transformation. In contrast to the extended kinship networks that characterized much of Europe, English families prioritized autonomy and economic independence. This arrangement allowed individuals to make decisions about property and labor without being constrained by collective familial obligations. Marriage practices reflected this individualism; English couples often chose partners based on personal and economic considerations rather than familial alliances. The system of primogeniture, where the eldest son inherited the family estate, concentrated wealth within families while encouraging younger siblings to seek opportunities independently in trade, urban professions, or colonial ventures. These social arrangements fostered a culture of self-reliance and entrepreneurship, key attributes of the capitalist ethos.

In his critique of Max Weber's thesis that the Protestant ethic catalyzed capitalism, Macfarlane argues that the capitalist spirit was already deeply rooted in medieval English culture. Traits such as hard work, frugality, and individual responsibility were well established long before the Reformation. The Catholic Church, often viewed as a conservative force in economic history, played a significant role in fostering these values. Monastic institutions managed large estates and engaged in profit-oriented activities such as brewing and milling, modeling disciplined labor and efficient management. The Church's support for literacy and numeracy, alongside the ecclesiastical courts' enforcement of contracts, contributed to a practical and ethical framework conducive to commerce and economic growth. These developments reveal that the spirit of capitalism in England predated the Protestant Reformation and emerged from its unique medieval context.

The growth of markets and urban centers further advanced England's economic evolution. The rapid urbanization of the medieval period transformed towns such as London, York, and Norwich into thriving hubs of economic activity. These towns became centers for the exchange of goods, services, and ideas, fostering innovation and entrepreneurship. Many towns were granted charters of incorporation, enabling them to self-govern and regulate trade independently of feudal authorities. This autonomy encouraged experimentation and competition, essential elements of capitalist economies. Guilds and professional associations played a key role in regulating production, maintaining quality standards, and training apprentices, while financial innovations such as credit instruments and early banking practices facilitated trade and investment.

Legal and institutional innovations were crucial in creating the stable environment necessary for economic growth. The common law system, which provided consistent and accessible mechanisms for resolving disputes, protected individual rights and property, creating an atmosphere of predictability and trust essential for market transactions. England's relatively weak feudalism distinguished it from other European nations. While feudal obligations existed, they were less rigid and oppressive than on the continent. Many peasants, particularly freemen, had opportunities to buy their freedom or migrate to towns, breaking the bonds of feudal dependence and fostering social mobility. This fluidity contributed to the emergence of a dynamic and entrepreneurial society.

The development of parliamentary traditions in the 13th century further reinforced this trajectory. England's Parliament became a forum where merchants, landowners, and urban representatives could influence national policy, creating a culture of negotiation and compromise. This early form of participatory governance supported the alignment of political and economic interests, providing a framework for sustained growth.

Macfarlane's work also emphasizes the stark contrasts between England and continental Europe. While much of Europe was characterized by collectivist landholding systems, extended kinship networks, and entrenched feudal hierarchies, England's institutions and cultural practices promoted individual autonomy and economic initiative. England's geographical isolation shielded it from the invasions and wars that disrupted much of Europe, allowing its institutions to evolve organically. This stability, combined with an open class system, encouraged innovation and social mobility, creating an environment where capitalist values could thrive.

The cultural values that emerged in medieval England—autonomy, pragmatism, and respect for individual achievement—formed the foundation of bourgeois society. These values permeated English literature, law, and religious practices, shaping a worldview that celebrated labor and enterprise. Unlike in France, where revolution was necessary to dismantle feudal structures, England's transition to modernity was marked by continuity and adaptation. The early emergence of bourgeois institutions and capitalist values allowed England to lead the world into the Industrial Revolution, becoming a model for economic and social modernization.

Alan Macfarlane's research fundamentally reshapes our understanding of the origins of capitalism by tracing its roots to medieval England. Through his detailed analysis of property rights, family structures, legal innovations, and urban development, Macfarlane demonstrates that the essential features of modern capitalist societies were firmly established by the 13th century. These developments reveal that England's historical trajectory as a pioneer of economic and social modernity was not a product of later revolutions or institutional innovations but the result of long-term cultural and social evolution. Macfarlane's insights offer profound contributions to our understanding of capitalism's foundations and the unique factors that enabled its emergence in England.

2 Alan Macfarlane's insights challenge Douglass North's institutional change theories

Alan Macfarlane's groundbreaking research into the historical roots of capitalism provides a compelling framework for critiquing Douglass North's institutional change theories. Although Macfarlane himself did not directly address North's arguments, his deep insights into England's unique historical development reveal significant shortcomings in North's framework. Macfarlane's findings demonstrate that England's cultural and social structures, established as early as the 11th to 13th centuries, were the true foundations of capitalism, predating and enabling the institutional changes that North emphasizes. By drawing on Macfarlane's studies, it becomes evident that North's narrative of institutional evolution overlooks critical cultural factors and misinterprets the origins of economic transformation in England.

Macfarlane's work highlights the deep cultural and social roots that fostered the rise of capitalism in England. Through his anthropological and historical research, he shows that individualism, autonomous family structures, and private property rights were already entrenched in English society by the 13th century. These elements shaped behaviors and norms that were integral to capitalist development. Macfarlane uncovers how inheritance practices, market-oriented agriculture, and legal customs supported an economic system based on individual autonomy and market participation. These practices were not imposed by external institutions but grew organically from England's social fabric.

North, by contrast, places formal institutions at the center of his analysis. He argues that institutional frameworks, such as property rights and political stability, are the primary drivers of economic growth. In works like The Rise of the Western World and Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance, North emphasizes the importance of reducing transaction costs and creating predictable systems through institutional mechanisms. For him, the development of constitutional government, secure property rights, and other early modern changes were critical turning points. Yet Macfarlane's findings show that these institutional innovations were not the origins of capitalism but the formalization of pre-existing cultural systems. England's distinctive individualism and market orientation were already well established before these changes occurred.

Macfarlane's insights challenge North's broader methodological approach. Where North relies on economic models and theoretical constructs like transaction costs and rational choice to explain institutional change, Macfarlane adopts an anthropological perspective that emphasizes historical specificity and cultural depth. By analyzing qualitative evidence, Macfarlane demonstrates how cultural practices, such as the nuclear family and customary law, underpinned economic behaviors. This approach reveals the limitations of North's mechanistic models, which simplify the complex interplay of cultural, social, and historical factors that shaped England's development. Macfarlane's work suggests that North's framework may work better for generalizing about societies but falls short when applied to the specific case of England, where unique cultural conditions played a defining role.

One area where Macfarlane's findings fundamentally undermine North's theories is the role of violence and stability. North argues that controlling violence and transitioning from "limited access orders" to "open access orders" is essential for economic development, as outlined in Violence and Social Orders. This narrative assumes that institutional change often requires violent upheaval and elite negotiation to stabilize systems of governance. Macfarlane's research shows that England's development of individual rights, private property, and market systems did not require such violent transitions. Instead, these changes emerged from a stable cultural and social order. England's trajectory demonstrates that economic transformation can arise from long-term cultural evolution rather than coercive or disruptive processes. This divergence challenges North's assertion that violence control is a universal prerequisite for economic growth and highlights the exceptionalism of England's path.

Macfarlane's findings also cast doubt on North's claims about the timing and significance of institutional changes in England. North attributes the rise of capitalism to events like the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which he sees as a pivotal moment for institutionalizing property rights and creating economic stability. Yet Macfarlane's research shows that by the 13th century, England already had a well-established capitalist ethos, rooted in its cultural and social organization. The constitutional changes of the 17th century did not create this ethos but merely codified and reinforced long-standing practices. This critique reveals that North's emphasis on institutional change in the early modern period ignores the deeper cultural and social processes that shaped England's economic success.

The exceptionalism of England's development underscores the limitations of North's universalist approach. North seeks to create generalizable models that explain the relationship between institutions and economic performance across societies. While this approach has theoretical value, Macfarlane's findings demonstrate that it cannot account for England's unique historical trajectory. England's early adoption of the nuclear family, its emphasis on private property, and its market orientation were not the results of institutional innovation but rather the product of centuries of cultural evolution. These distinct features challenge the applicability of North's theories to the English case and call into question their broader universality.

By leveraging Macfarlane's insights, it becomes clear that North's institutionalist framework offers an incomplete explanation of England's rise as a capitalist society. Macfarlane's research reveals that the cultural and social foundations of capitalism were firmly in place in England centuries before the institutional changes North highlights. This deep cultural continuity enabled England to develop capitalist systems organically, without the need for the violent disruptions or formal institutional innovations that North describes. Macfarlane's anthropological perspective offers a richer and more nuanced account of England's historical development, exposing the limitations of North's reductionist models and reframing our understanding of capitalism's origins.

In conclusion, Alan Macfarlane's work provides a powerful lens through which to critique Douglass North's theories of institutional change. By demonstrating that England's unique cultural and social organization was the true foundation of capitalism, Macfarlane challenges the notion that formal institutions were the primary drivers of economic growth. His findings show that the essential features of capitalism were embedded in England's social fabric long before the early modern period, undermining North's emphasis on institutional evolution. Through his detailed historical and anthropological research, Macfarlane dismantles North's framework, offering a more compelling and accurate explanation for the rise of capitalism in England and its exceptional trajectory in world history.

3 Alan Macfarlane's research provides a compelling framework for critiquing the influential arguments of Douglass North and Barry Weingast in their 1989 paper, Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England.

North and Weingast argue that the Glorious Revolution of 1688 was a transformative moment in English history, establishing constitutional government, securing property rights, and fostering the credibility needed for economic modernization. They portray this institutional shift as the foundation of England's economic growth and as a decisive break from earlier periods of political and economic instability. However, Macfarlane's studies reveal that the cultural, social, and legal roots of capitalism in England were already deeply established by the 13th century, making the changes of 1688 less revolutionary than North and Weingast claim. While Macfarlane does not directly critique their work, his findings expose significant flaws in their framework, particularly their overemphasis on institutional innovation and their neglect of the long-term cultural foundations of England's economic development.

Macfarlane's research highlights how the essential features of capitalism—secure property rights, individualism, market orientation, and decentralized governance—were already present in medieval England. By the 12th century, the common law system provided strong protections for private property and contracts, creating a stable legal environment that supported economic activity. Courts were accessible and effective in resolving disputes, ensuring that property rights were upheld and that economic actors could trust the legal framework. This stability was further reinforced by the Magna Carta of 1215 and subsequent legal developments, which constrained the arbitrary power of the monarchy. Contrary to North and Weingast's claim that property rights became secure only after the Glorious Revolution, Macfarlane's findings demonstrate that these legal foundations had been in place for centuries, fostering an environment conducive to long-term investment and economic growth.

In addition to secure property rights, Macfarlane identifies individualism as a central cultural characteristic of English society that predates the institutional changes of the 17th century. Unlike many other European societies, where extended kinship networks dominated, England was characterized by a nuclear family structure that emphasized autonomy and economic independence. This cultural orientation supported the development of private property ownership and market-based economic activity. By the 13th century, English society was already exhibiting behaviors and norms associated with capitalism, including the prioritization of personal responsibility and the pursuit of profit through individual initiative. These cultural traits created the conditions for economic modernization long before the formal institutional changes North and Weingast emphasize.

England's market orientation also developed centuries before the Glorious Revolution. Agricultural commercialization, the growth of market towns, and the emergence of merchant guilds in medieval England all point to a society increasingly integrated into competitive markets. Decentralized governance, through local councils and courts, further facilitated economic activity by providing a regulatory framework that was responsive to local needs. By the time of the 17th century, England already had a thriving market economy, driven by cultural and social forces rather than institutional innovation. North and Weingast's portrayal of 1688 as a turning point overlooks this long history of economic dynamism and misattributes its origins to constitutional reforms.

Macfarlane's research also challenges the idea that the Glorious Revolution was a watershed moment for governmental credibility. North and Weingast argue that the shift of power from the monarchy to Parliament created a system of checks and balances that enhanced the government's ability to commit to upholding property rights and honoring financial contracts. However, Macfarlane's findings show that the credibility of England's governance was not a product of 17th-century institutional changes but of long-standing cultural and legal traditions. The common law system and the role of courts in enforcing contracts had already established a high degree of trust in the legal and political system by the medieval period. These cultural and institutional foundations ensured the stability and predictability of governance, rendering the constitutional changes of 1688 less transformative than North and Weingast suggest.

By reframing the Glorious Revolution as part of a broader continuum of institutional and cultural evolution, Macfarlane provides a more nuanced understanding of England's historical development. The constitutional changes of 1688 were not the origin of capitalism in England but a formalization of practices and norms that had been evolving for centuries. The principle of limited government, for example, can be traced back to the Magna Carta and the development of parliamentary governance in the 13th and 14th centuries. These earlier milestones established the constraints on sovereign power and the legal protections for property that North and Weingast attribute to the Glorious Revolution. Macfarlane's perspective reveals that England's economic success was the result of long-term cultural and social processes, not sudden institutional innovation.

This critique of North and Weingast's framework has broader implications for the study of economic history. Their model assumes that institutional reforms can be transplanted across societies to achieve similar outcomes, but Macfarlane's findings highlight the importance of cultural and historical specificity. England's exceptional trajectory was shaped by a unique combination of individualism, legal traditions, and decentralized governance that cannot be easily replicated. By focusing on formal institutions and downplaying the role of culture, North and Weingast fail to capture the deeper dynamics that underpinned England's success.

Macfarlane's research not only challenges the specific claims of North and Weingast but also exposes the limitations of their broader institutionalist approach. By attributing economic growth to formal institutional changes, they overlook the cultural and social foundations that make such institutions effective. In the case of England, the changes of 1688 were not a cause of economic modernization but a reflection of cultural and legal practices that had been firmly established for centuries. This misinterpretation distorts our understanding of the origins of capitalism and the factors that drive economic success.

In conclusion, Alan Macfarlane's insights offer a powerful critique of North and Weingast's 1989 paper. By demonstrating that the cultural and social foundations of capitalism were firmly established in England long before the Glorious Revolution, Macfarlane undermines their claim that the constitutional changes of 1688 were the primary drivers of economic modernization. His findings reveal that England's economic success was rooted in centuries of cultural evolution, legal stability, and market-oriented behavior, making the Glorious Revolution a formalization of existing practices rather than a transformative moment. Macfarlane's perspective not only reframes our understanding of England's history but also challenges the universality of institutionalist models, highlighting the need for greater attention to cultural and historical specificity in the study of economic development. Through his work, Macfarlane dismantles the North-Weingast framework and offers a more nuanced and accurate account of the origins of modern capitalism.

4 The Transplantation of English Institutions to the United States: A Critique of Douglass North from Alan Macfarlane's Perspective

Alan Macfarlane's groundbreaking work on the historical roots of capitalism and individualism offers a compelling critique of Douglass North's institutionalist framework, particularly regarding the development of the United States. According to Macfarlane, the institutions of the United States in the 17th century were not novel creations but direct transplants from England. These institutions, rooted in centuries of English legal, social, and cultural development, required little innovation in the American colonies. This view challenges North's argument that the institutional changes in colonial America were critical to its economic success. By exploring Macfarlane's insights alongside North's theories, this essay examines the contention that the United States' institutional foundation was a continuation of England's medieval and early modern traditions, rendering North's claims about American institutional changes redundant.

English Foundations of American Institutions

Macfarlane's work emphasizes the depth and longevity of England's institutional and cultural heritage, which he traces to the 11th to 13th centuries. By the time English settlers established colonies in America during the 17th century, the key elements of capitalist and governance systems were already well-developed in their homeland. The settlers brought with them England's common law, property rights frameworks, family structures, and governance practices, which were adapted to the American context with minimal alteration.

For instance, the English legal tradition of common law, emphasizing private property and contract enforcement, became the cornerstone of American jurisprudence. Similarly, the nuclear family structure, which prioritized autonomy and economic independence, was transplanted wholesale. Even the decentralized systems of local governance, seen in the form of townships and county councils in the colonies, were direct adaptations of English practices. Macfarlane argues that these institutions had already proven their efficacy in England, making them natural candidates for replication in the New World.

The capitalist ethos was another crucial import. According to Macfarlane, the values of individualism, market orientation, and entrepreneurial spirit were deeply embedded in English culture long before the colonial period. These values were not unique to America; they were a continuation of centuries of English social and economic evolution. The colonists, far from innovating, simply extended England's established institutional and cultural framework into a new geographical setting.

Douglass North's Theory of Institutional Change

Douglass North, in works such as Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance (1990) and Constitutions and Commitment (1989), posits a different narrative. North emphasizes the role of institutions as the "rules of the game" that structure economic, political, and social interactions. He argues that the United States experienced significant institutional changes in response to the unique conditions of the colonies, such as abundant land and labor scarcity. These changes, according to North, were pivotal in reducing transaction costs and fostering economic growth.

For example, North highlights the evolution of labor contracts, such as indentured servitude, which addressed the colonies' labor shortages. He also points to the decentralized governance of the colonies as an example of institutional innovation, where participatory political structures allowed for greater local autonomy. North sees these developments as essential in creating a distinct institutional trajectory for the United States.

Macfarlane's Critique of North

Macfarlane fundamentally challenges North's view of institutional change in the United States. From Macfarlane's perspective, the institutions North describes as innovative were, in fact, pre-existing English systems simply adapted to the colonial context. The American institutional framework was a continuation of English traditions rather than a departure from them.

Continuity Over Innovation

Macfarlane argues that the key institutions North identifies—property rights, legal frameworks, and governance structures—were already well-established in England by the 13th century. For example, the capitalist spirit that North attributes to institutional changes in colonial America had been deeply ingrained in English culture for centuries. The settlers did not need to invent new systems; they merely implemented familiar practices in a new environment.

Cultural Foundations

For Macfarlane, the cultural continuity between England and the American colonies was more significant than any institutional adaptation. The ethos of individualism, the sanctity of contracts, and the value placed on private property were not innovations of the colonies but imports from England. This cultural foundation made the institutions North emphasizes possible, undermining his claim that they were unique to the American context.

Conditions of the New World

North emphasizes the unique conditions of the colonies—such as land abundance and labor scarcity—as drivers of institutional change. Macfarlane, however, sees these conditions as merely reinforcing the adaptability of English institutions. The flexibility of English systems, developed over centuries, allowed them to thrive in the colonial context without significant modification. This adaptability highlights the strength of England's institutional and cultural heritage rather than the novelty of American institutions.

Comparing English and American Institutional Trajectories

The contrast between Macfarlane and North can be summarized in their differing views on the origins of capitalist institutions and the role of culture versus institutional change. Macfarlane situates the development of capitalism within the long history of English society, emphasizing the deep roots of individualism and market-oriented behavior. North, on the other hand, attributes the rise of capitalism in the U.S. to the innovative institutional responses to the challenges of the New World.

Legal and Governance Systems

While North highlights the decentralization of governance in the American colonies as a key innovation, Macfarlane points out that this system was a direct transplant of English practices. The township and county structures in the colonies mirrored those in England, demonstrating continuity rather than divergence.

Economic Behavior

North's emphasis on the role of institutions in shaping economic behavior overlooks the cultural foundation Macfarlane identifies. The market-oriented behavior of American settlers was not a product of institutional change but a continuation of English values and practices.

Divergence or Adaptation?

North sees the American institutional framework as diverging from England's, but Macfarlane argues that the U.S. simply adapted England's institutions to its unique conditions. This adaptation, Macfarlane asserts, underscores the robustness of English systems rather than the distinctiveness of American ones.

Thus, Alan Macfarlane's analysis exposes fundamental flaws in Douglass North's narrative about institutional change in the United States. By demonstrating that the U.S. institutions of the 17th century were largely transplanted from England, Macfarlane refutes the idea that American institutional development represented a significant departure or innovation. Instead, he emphasizes the cultural and institutional continuity between England and the American colonies, arguing that the foundations of capitalism and governance were already well-established in England centuries before the colonial period. While North's focus on institutional evolution offers valuable insights into economic history, Macfarlane's deep cultural analysis provides a more compelling explanation for the origins of American institutions, rendering North's claims about U.S. institutional changes unnecessary and, in Macfarlane's view, fundamentally misguided.

5 Alan Macfarlane's extensive research into the historical development of capitalism fundamentally challenges—and arguably dismantles—the core principles of New Institutional Economics (NIE).

NIE, championed by scholars like Douglass North, emphasizes the role of institutions—defined as formal rules, informal norms, and their enforcement mechanisms—in shaping economic performance and societal development. According to NIE, the rise of capitalism and economic modernity is explained through the evolution of efficient institutions that reduce transaction costs, provide credible commitments, and stabilize markets. However, Macfarlane's work, rooted in the cultural and legal history of medieval England, systematically undermines these claims by demonstrating that capitalism emerged not through institutional reforms but as a result of unique cultural, social, and legal practices that were deeply entrenched centuries before the institutional changes NIE scholars typically emphasize.

Macfarlane's Emphasis on Cultural Foundations vs. Institutional Determinism

One of the most significant challenges Macfarlane poses to NIE is his argument that cultural values, not formal institutions, were the true foundation for the rise of capitalism in England. NIE treats culture as a secondary factor—a product or reflection of the underlying institutional and economic framework. However, Macfarlane's research demonstrates that England's transition to capitalism was fundamentally shaped by long-standing cultural values, particularly individualism, autonomy, and personal responsibility, which were already well established by the 11th to 13th centuries.

In medieval England, the nuclear family structure promoted individual economic agency and decision-making. Unlike the extended kinship networks that dominated much of Europe, English families prioritized independence, allowing individuals to make economic choices free from collective obligations. Practices like primogeniture concentrated property in the hands of a single heir, encouraging younger siblings to seek opportunities in trade, crafts, or urban professions. This cultural ethos of independence and economic innovation directly fostered the entrepreneurial spirit that underpinned the rise of capitalism.

Macfarlane's findings challenge NIE's focus on institutional incentives, showing that economic behavior in England was not primarily shaped by institutions but by deeply ingrained cultural norms. Individualism, autonomy, and self-reliance were cultural preconditions for the development of markets, long before the formal institutions that NIE emphasizes were fully established.

The Early Evolution of Legal Systems

Another critical point where Macfarlane diverges from NIE is his analysis of legal systems. NIE places great weight on formal institutional reforms, such as the establishment of property rights or the development of modern legal frameworks, as key drivers of economic growth. Douglass North, for example, argues that secure property rights and the rule of law, which he links to events like the Glorious Revolution of 1688, were decisive in creating the conditions for capitalism.

Macfarlane's work dismantles this narrative by showing that the critical legal foundations of capitalism were in place in England centuries earlier. By the 12th century, England's common law system had established robust protections for private property and contracts. These protections were enforced consistently across the country, creating a predictable legal environment that encouraged long-term investment and economic activity. The role of royal courts, local manorial courts, and itinerant justices ensured that disputes could be resolved efficiently, fostering trust in the legal system.

Macfarlane highlights how the development of common law was not a sudden institutional innovation but the product of gradual evolution, rooted in the pragmatic needs of English society. This perspective fundamentally challenges

NIE's emphasis on dramatic institutional changes as the primary drivers of economic growth. In England, the predictability and flexibility of the common law system preceded and enabled the rise of markets, rather than being a response to economic pressures or formal institutional reform.

The Flexibility of Feudalism and the Transition to Capitalism

NIE often frames feudalism as a rigid and inefficient economic system that was supplanted by capitalism through institutional reforms aimed at reducing transaction costs and resolving the inefficiencies of feudal production. This perspective assumes a universal progression in which feudal hierarchies collapse under the weight of their contradictions, making way for more efficient institutional arrangements. Macfarlane, however, paints a far more complex picture of England's feudal system, showing that it was flexible, decentralized, and conducive to gradual economic change.

In England, unlike much of continental Europe, feudal obligations were relatively light, and many peasants had significant economic agency. Freemen, in particular, had access to property rights and could participate in local markets. Opportunities for social mobility allowed individuals to escape feudal dependencies by purchasing freedom or migrating to towns, where they could engage in trade or crafts. This mobility undermines NIE's narrative of feudal rigidity and demonstrates that the transition to capitalism in England did not require the institutional overhaul that NIE emphasizes. Instead, capitalism emerged through the incremental adaptation of pre-existing social and legal practices.

The Misinterpretation of Institutional Credibility

NIE often attributes the rise of capitalism to the ability of institutions to create credible commitments. Douglass North and Barry Weingast's famous 1989 paper argues that the Glorious Revolution of 1688 was a watershed moment that enhanced the credibility of the English government by limiting the arbitrary powers of the monarchy and strengthening the role of Parliament. According to this view, these institutional changes reassured economic actors that property rights and contracts would be upheld, fostering investment and economic growth.

Macfarlane's findings dismantle this claim by demonstrating that institutional credibility in England long predates the Glorious Revolution. The common law system and the consistent enforcement of contracts had already established a high degree of trust in economic transactions by the 13th century. Moreover, local governance structures, such as town charters and manorial courts, allowed communities to self-regulate and enforce agreements, further enhancing economic stability. These developments show that the conditions for credible commitments were already in place, rooted in legal and cultural traditions, rather than being the result of institutional reforms in the 17th century. This critique suggests that NIE overstates the importance of formal institutional changes while neglecting the deeper cultural and historical processes that underpin economic stability.

The Gradual Development of Markets

NIE often portrays markets as emerging from institutional reforms that create the conditions for trade and investment. However, Macfarlane demonstrates that market-oriented practices were deeply embedded in English society long before the formal institutional changes that NIE highlights. By the 13th century, England had a thriving network of local and regional markets, supported by the commercialization of agriculture and the growth of urban centers. Towns like London and York became hubs of trade, innovation, and financial experimentation. These developments occurred independently of large-scale institutional reforms and were instead driven by local economic activity and cultural attitudes toward commerce.

Macfarlane's analysis challenges NIE's implicit assumption that markets are dependent on formal institutions. In England, markets evolved organically, supported by social practices, legal protections, and cultural norms that predated the institutional innovations NIE credits with their creation. This perspective calls into question the universality of NIE's models, showing that markets can emerge in the absence of formal institutional intervention.

The Flaws of Universalism in NIE

NIE aims to provide universal models for understanding the relationship between institutions and economic development, arguing that certain institutional arrangements—such as secure property rights and the rule of law—are universally necessary for economic growth. Macfarlane's research reveals the limitations of this approach by highlighting the unique historical and cultural context of England's development. Unlike many other societies, where feudal hierarchies persisted or evolved into alternative systems, England's relatively weak feudalism, strong legal traditions, and culture of individualism created a specific environment for capitalism to emerge.

Macfarlane's findings show that capitalism was not an inevitable stage in societal evolution, as NIE often implies, but a contingent phenomenon shaped by unique historical conditions. This critique undermines the universality of NIE's models and suggests that its focus on institutional efficiency fails to capture the complexity and diversity of historical development.

Hence, Alan Macfarlane's research provides a devastating critique of New Institutional Economics by challenging its core assumptions about the origins of capitalism and the role of institutions in economic history. By emphasizing the importance of culture, legal traditions, and social organization, Macfarlane demonstrates that the emergence of capitalism in England cannot be reduced to institutional reforms or universal economic principles. His findings reveal that the foundations of capitalism were deeply rooted in the cultural and legal practices of medieval England, centuries before the formal institutional changes that NIE emphasizes. By exposing the limitations of NIE's determinism, universalism, and overreliance on institutional explanations, Macfarlane reshapes our understanding of economic history and offers a richer, more nuanced account of the origins of capitalism. Through his work, Macfarlane not only critiques NIE but also provides an alternative framework for understanding the complex interplay of culture, law, and economy in shaping historical trajectories.

6 Alan Macfarlane's insights provide a potent critique of Karl Marx's historical materialism, particularly Marx's linear, deterministic model of historical progression through modes of production.

Alan Macfarlane's insights offer a compelling critique of Karl Marx's historical materialism, particularly its deterministic and linear model of societal development through economic modes of production. Marx's theory posits that societies inevitably progress from feudalism to capitalism due to the contradictions within feudal economic structures and the rise of class struggles. Capitalism, in Marx's view, emerges as a universal and necessary stage in this progression. However, Macfarlane's detailed studies of medieval England reveal that the emergence of capitalism was neither inevitable nor universal but deeply rooted in specific cultural, legal, and social conditions unique to England. His findings challenge the fundamental assumptions of Marx's framework, which overly prioritizes economic structures and class conflict while neglecting the influence of culture, institutions, and individual agency.

One of the most significant ways Macfarlane's research critiques Marx is by emphasizing the role of culture, particularly the early emergence of individualism in England, as a driving force behind the rise of capitalism. While Marx viewed culture as a mere reflection of the underlying economic base, Macfarlane demonstrates that English society by the 11th to 13th centuries was already characterized by a cultural ethos that prioritized personal autonomy, private property, and economic self-reliance. This cultural orientation was embedded in the nuclear family structure, which stood in stark contrast to the extended kinship networks that dominated much of continental Europe. The nuclear family allowed individuals to make decisions about property and labor without the constraints of collective familial obligations, fostering a culture of independence and entrepreneurship. Practices such as primogeniture concentrated wealth within families and encouraged younger siblings to seek economic opportunities through trade or urban professions, laying the groundwork for capitalist enterprise.

Macfarlane's findings also challenge Marx's characterization of feudalism as a uniform system that inevitably collapsed under its own contradictions. In much of continental Europe, feudal structures were rigid and hierarchical, with peasants often bound to the land and subject to heavy obligations to their lords. In contrast, England's feudal system was relatively decentralized and flexible. Many English peasants, particularly freemen, had access to property rights, opportunities to buy their freedom, and participation in local markets. These conditions reduced the exploitation and class tensions that Marx viewed as central to feudalism and its eventual downfall. Instead of being overthrown through revolutionary class struggle, England's feudal system gradually evolved, creating a seamless transition to market-oriented practices and capitalist development.

Another critical flaw in Marx's framework, as revealed by Macfarlane's work, is its neglect of the role of legal institutions in shaping economic systems. Marx largely viewed legal systems as instruments of class domination, designed to enforce the interests of the ruling class. Macfarlane, however, underscores the importance of England's common law system in creating the conditions necessary for capitalism. By the 12th century, English common law had established strong protections for private property, enforced contracts, and provided consistent mechanisms for dispute resolution. This legal framework fostered trust and predictability in economic transactions, enabling the growth of markets and encouraging long-term investment. These legal developments were not merely reflections of economic structures but active contributors to the emergence of capitalist practices, challenging Marx's assumption that economic conditions alone determine societal change.

Macfarlane's research also reveals that market-oriented practices were deeply embedded in medieval English society long before the formal emergence of capitalism. By the 13th century, England had a thriving network of local and regional markets, supported by agricultural commercialization and the growth of urban centers. Towns like London and York became hubs of trade and innovation, with self-governing charters that allowed them to regulate commerce independently of feudal authorities. These developments contradict Marx's assertion that market economies only arose after the collapse of feudalism and instead highlight the gradual and organic evolution of capitalist practices in England.

Perhaps the most profound critique of Marx's framework is its universalist assumptions. Marx's theory presents the transition from feudalism to capitalism as a universal process driven by the same economic forces and class dynamics across societies. Macfarlane's findings reveal the limitations of this perspective by emphasizing the specificity of England's historical experience. Unlike many other feudal societies, where centralized and oppressive hierarchies inhibited economic development, England's relatively weak feudalism, strong legal traditions, and culture of individualism provided the unique conditions for capitalism to emerge. These factors were not replicated in other parts of the world, where feudal structures either persisted or transitioned into alternative systems. By focusing on the particularities of England's development, Macfarlane demonstrates that capitalism was not an inevitable stage in human history but a contingent phenomenon that arose under specific historical conditions.

Macfarlane also challenges Marx's emphasis on class struggle as the primary driver of historical change. While Marx viewed societal transformation as the result of conflicts between economic classes, Macfarlane highlights the role of individual agency and cultural innovation in shaping history. In medieval England, the autonomy of individuals within nuclear families, the adaptability of local governance structures, and the flexibility of legal institutions all contributed to the emergence of capitalist practices without the need for revolutionary upheaval. This emphasis on gradual evolution and cultural agency provides a more nuanced understanding of historical change than Marx's rigid determinism.

By reframing the rise of capitalism as a culturally and institutionally specific phenomenon, Macfarlane undermines Marx's deterministic model and offers a richer, more historically grounded account of economic development. His research demonstrates that capitalism in England was not the inevitable outcome of feudal contradictions or universal economic laws but the product of long-term cultural evolution, legal stability, and market activity. This perspective calls into question the universality of Marx's historical materialism and highlights the importance of culture, institutions, and individual agency in shaping the course of history. Through his detailed studies of medieval England, Macfarlane not only critiques Marx's framework but also reshapes our understanding of the origins of capitalism and the factors that drive societal change.

7 Conclusion

Alan Macfarlane's research offers a profound critique of some of the most influential theories in economic and social history, including the works of Douglass North, New Institutional Economics (NIE), Max Weber, and Karl Marx. Macfarlane challenges these frameworks by demonstrating that the roots of capitalism in England lie not in institutional reforms, Protestant ethics, or class struggles, but in the unique cultural, legal, and social conditions that developed as early as the 11th to 13th centuries. His work emphasizes the contingent and culturally specific nature of capitalism, rejecting the determinism and universality often found in these theories.

Challenging Douglass North and New Institutional Economics

Douglass North and New Institutional Economics argue that institutions—formal rules, informal norms, and enforcement mechanisms—are the primary drivers of economic performance and the emergence of capitalism. North, in particular, highlights events like the Glorious Revolution of 1688 as pivotal moments that institutionalized property rights, reduced transaction costs, and created governmental credibility. Macfarlane dismantles this narrative by showing that the key features of capitalism in England—individual property ownership, contract enforcement, and market participation—were already well established by the 13th century, long before the institutional changes NIE emphasizes.

Macfarlane's research highlights how England's common law system, developed under Henry II, provided a consistent legal framework that protected property rights and resolved disputes. This legal infrastructure fostered economic stability and predictability, creating the conditions for market growth without requiring the kind of formal institutional overhaul that NIE often credits. Furthermore, Macfarlane emphasizes the role of cultural values, such as individualism and autonomy, in shaping economic behavior. These values were deeply embedded in English society and drove market-oriented practices independently of institutional reforms. This critique challenges the determinism and universal applicability of NIE, arguing that capitalism arose in England due to its unique cultural and historical context, not through generalized institutional mechanisms.

Critiquing Max Weber's Protestant Ethic Thesis

Max Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism posits that the rise of capitalism was driven by cultural changes brought about by Protestantism, particularly its emphasis on hard work, frugality, and rational economic behavior. Macfarlane directly challenges this thesis by demonstrating that these capitalist values were present in England centuries before the Protestant Reformation. He points to the Catholic Church's role in fostering economic rationality through monastic management of agricultural estates, profit-oriented enterprises, and the promotion of literacy and numeracy. English society, with its emphasis on individual responsibility, market engagement, and contractual obligations, already exhibited the traits Weber attributes to Protestantism.

Macfarlane also highlights the role of the nuclear family in medieval England, which promoted economic independence and self-reliance. Unlike the extended kinship networks that dominated much of Europe, the English family structure allowed for greater autonomy in decision-making, fostering a culture of entrepreneurship and innovation. By placing the origins of capitalist values in the medieval period, Macfarlane undermines Weber's claim that Protestantism was the critical cultural force behind capitalism.

Undermining Marx's Historical Materialism

Karl Marx's historical materialism views the progression from feudalism to capitalism as an inevitable outcome of economic contradictions within feudal systems and the resulting class struggles. Macfarlane challenges this deterministic framework by showing that the transition to capitalism in England was not the result of class conflict but of gradual cultural, legal, and social evolution. Unlike the rigid feudal hierarchies of continental Europe, England's feudal system was relatively decentralized and flexible, allowing peasants significant mobility and access to property rights. Freemen, in particular, could engage in local markets and buy their freedom, creating a dynamic rural economy.

Macfarlane also critiques Marx's neglect of legal and institutional factors in historical development. While Marx viewed law as an instrument of class domination, Macfarlane emphasizes the role of England's common law system in creating a predictable and equitable framework for economic transactions. This legal stability, combined with cultural values of individualism, allowed capitalism to emerge in England without the revolutionary upheaval Marx considered essential. Macfarlane's findings suggest that capitalism was not a universal stage in societal evolution but a contingent phenomenon shaped by England's unique historical conditions.

Reframing the Narrative of Capitalism's Origins

Macfarlane's work offers a fundamentally different explanation for the rise of capitalism, rooted in the specific cultural and legal traditions of medieval England. By the 13th century, England had developed a market-oriented economy supported by the commercialization of agriculture, the growth of towns, and a vibrant network of local and regional markets. These developments were not driven by institutional reforms, religious movements, or class struggles but by a combination of cultural values, legal frameworks, and social practices that were uniquely English.

Macfarlane's critique exposes the limitations of universalist theories like those of North, Weber, and Marx. He demonstrates that capitalism's emergence in England was a historically contingent process that cannot be reduced to generalized models of institutional efficiency, Protestant ethics, or economic determinism. Instead, it was the product of centuries of cultural and social evolution, creating a distinct environment where capitalist practices could thrive. Through his detailed analysis, Macfarlane reshapes our understanding of capitalism's origins, challenging the dominant narratives of economic and social history.