

## Summary

### *"Accidents at Work, Security and Compensation in Industrializing Europe. The cases of Britain, Germany, and Italy, 1870-1925"*

by Julia Moses

Julia Moses traces the way in which the involvement of the state - more precisely, of the British, German, and Italian states - variously restructured the conception of private (corporate) liability for workplace accidents. All three states mandated the provision of compensation for such accidents without providing it directly themselves; nevertheless, their involvement raised expectations of public assurance which they did not fully meet. That involvement itself came about as a result of wider shifts in the public understanding of the workplace and the nature of its attendant risks, and through a complex interplay between legislators, unions, employers' bodies, and awareness of cross-border events and theories (particularly in Italy). The distinction between common and civil law jurisdictions plays a role in this story, but a less significant one than one might expect, as the three states influenced each other in redefining the worker-employer relationship and the nature of work itself. Such redefinitions involved making accidents a statistical hazard rather than an individual moral failing, and workers aware of the state's role in ensuring their protection rather than reliant on their employers or themselves alone. These complex changes effected a transition to a more "personal and interventionist" and "individualised", yet less individually moralized, form of security provided by compensation schemes. Moses remarks on the difficulty of demoralizing the notion of compensation entirely: her account of Italian and German debates about "pension addicts" foreshadows the concerns about "compensation culture" today which Grant's and Squires' articles also address, as part of a concern with individual responsibility which is also central to all three articles.