

I have *The Economist* Historical Archive. Why do I need the *FT*?



Five reasons...

- 1 The two archives complement, not compete with, each other.**
 In fact, the *FT* owns half of *The Economist*. Together they create a complete picture of world business, economic and political history.
- 2 *The Economist* is a weekly review. The *FT* is a daily newspaper of record.**
 With the *FT* you get day-by-day coverage of the world's events and markets – news and business as it happened.
- 3 The *Financial Times* tells you what happened. *The Economist* tells you why.**
 If you want commentary and analysis of the week's events, you should refer to *The Economist*. If you want to see the actual reporting of those events, you should use the *FT*. So users may well start with the *FT* to read about an event, then look at the *Economist* to see an assessment of that event. Plus the two archives are cross-searchable via Gale NewsVault, making researching in this way even easier.
- 4 Different styles of journalism. The *FT* avoids having a strong agenda, preferring to focus on sober reporting of news and events. *The Economist* is much more opinionated** – it explicitly supports free markets, globalisation, free movement of labour, and the legalisation of drugs to name but a few. Its stance on many issues can be described as neo-liberal.
- 5 Both publications have excellent track records in predicting economic storms.**
 In 1998-9, *The Economist* forecast the bursting of the dot.com bubble (and was ridiculed). In the 2000s, Gillian Tett at the *Financial Times* wrote consistently about City excesses, and the dangers of the complex financial instruments (such as credit default swaps) that led to the credit crunch. It will be very useful for researchers to read these columns again in hindsight.