

Altogether, this book provides a paradigm of the criticisms commonly heard about Oxford doctoral theses. By the same token occasional gaffes tolerable in a thesis (who can claim without a blush not to have perpetrated any?) have no place in a scholarly book from a scholarly publishing house: for example, the description of Wilmot Horton as 'Permanent Under-Secretary' (page 22), and assertion that 'no more convicts were sent to New South Wales after 1840' (page 141) and (page 30), George Higgin Botham [sic]. If this review has been severe it is precisely because Swinfen is clearly an intelligent scholar and his book could have become authoritative with further research. Alternatively its limitations should have been made explicit. As it is the book claims an authority it does not really possess.

NOEL McLACHLAN

University of Melbourne

The Colonial Office, 1868-1892. By Brian L. Blakeley. Duke University Press: Durham, N.C. 1972. xvi, 195 pp. U.S. price: \$9.50.

PROFESSOR BLAKELEY'S book is a study in administrative history. He has delved deep into the correspondence in the general department of the Colonial Office records and produced an interesting book in a field where a dull man could easily write a dull one. The warp in the pattern is the personnel of the Office, especially R. G. W. Herbert, who joined it as assistant under-secretary in 1870 and fifteen months later became permanent under-secretary, a post he held for twenty-one years. Dr Blakeley gives a good sketch of Herbert and his chief colleagues, especially Sir Robert Meade, who ultimately succeeded him. The woof is civil service reform. Gladstone's curious combination of reforming zeal and a passion for economy inspired his subordinates to do some odd things. Dr Blakeley calls his second chapter 'The Formation of the New Office, 1868-1872'. Three years saw the retirement of several senior officials and an internal reorganization designed to reduce the size and cost of the Office but the same time increase salaries to attract abler men. The principal saving was to come through a gradual reduction in the number of upper division clerks from twenty-six to eighteen. As the work was steadily increasing, especially the African work, some of the senior clerks were under severe strain — lessened perhaps by the fact that they still only worked a six-hour day. The abler men were to be secured by open competition, but the reduction of staff meant that no 'competition wallah' entered the office until 1877, when C. P. Lucas and R. L. Antrobus were appointed. The gentle, scholarly Lucas became one of the best-liked members of the staff and Antrobus, a bugbear to both Lugard and MacGregor and no doubt to other governors, one of the least popular. The trouble was that the new men 'generally regarded themselves as the intellectual superiors of the men serving in the colonies'.

Another reform was the sharp demarcation between the upper division and the lower division clerks who performed merely mechanical work, copying, indexing and the like. In the early 1880s the rude mechanicals banded together and presented two petitions to the Treasury, the second with 1500 signatures from various offices. The Treasury attitude was stiff, though there was a hint of more opportunities of promotion and the agitation led to a new inquiry under Sir Matthew Ridley. The book has a chapter on the Crown Agents and the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission which reveals one or two curious details about the Crown Agents' services in raising New Zealand loans.

Altogether it will be a very useful reference book for all who work on the colonial history of the period. The style is unpretentious but readable and commendably free from jargon. Dr Blakeley has a certain tendency to repeat points in almost identical words and occasionally to use quotations twice. He also has a misdirected affection for the word 'prestigious' and even 'prestigiously'. But these are minor blemishes in his scholarly book.

W. P. MORRELL

University of Otago

Henry Labouchere and the Empire 1880-1905 By R. J. Hind. University of London Historical Studies XXXI. Athlone Press. 1972. xii, 271 pp. U.K. price: £4.50.

It is a sad fact, considering the substantial contribution which they make to the output of historical monographs, that Ph.D. theses rarely turn into satisfactory books. So often there is a curiously dated air about them, the result of the historiographical vacuum in which they appear to have been left suspended since the author completed his original doctoral research. And the format is too often cramped and stilted, reflecting somebody's idea once upon a time of what might constitute a 'good Ph.D. topic'.

Dr Hind's new book on Henry Labouchere is unfortunately very typical of the Ph.D. thesis-turned-monograph. A really interesting, even exciting, work is discernible within it, waiting to be released, but the stifling Ph.D. format has been left clamped down.

In 1968 two books were published which throw considerable light on Labouchere's attitude to the Empire — Bernard Porter's *Critics of Empire* and Jeffrey Butler's *The Liberal Party and the Jameson Raid*. Had Dr Hind taken these into account, his own thinking on Labouchere might have been very profitably revitalized; but there is no reference to either in his book, not even in his bibliography.

Henry Labouchere, Radical M.P. for Northampton between 1880 and 1905 and outspoken critic of 'forward' policies in the Empire, is probably worth a book. (He has actually had two devoted to him already, but one was a rather unexciting 'official' biography by A. L. Thorold in 1913 and the other Hesketh Pearson's entertaining but light-weight *Labby*, published