

*The London Journal of Edward Jerningham Wakefield 1845-46*. Edited by Joan Stevens. Alexander Turnbull Library and Victoria University of Wellington, 1972. xv, 192 pp. N.Z. price: \$6.00.

LIKE HIS father, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, Jerningham Wakefield had energy, ambition, the ability to mesmerise, and a fluent pen. With his father, he immersed himself in the politics of colonisation and of colonies themselves, but to even less personal advancement. For Jerningham Wakefield managed his money, thirst and sexual energy imprudently enough to thwart his more public ambitions. He achieved little but a modest share in the life-work of another man: his father.

Yet our historical sources would be the poorer without his lively *Adventure in New Zealand*, first published in 1845, soon after his return to England. That personal story is unexpectedly continued in a journal recently discovered, lodged in the Alexander Turnbull Library, and now published for the first time. The Journal, written mainly in London in 1845 and 1846, is compressed, often cryptic, and comparatively short. Its contents will require few historians to revise their conclusions about either the Wakefields or the politics of colonisation. Nevertheless it contains considerable circumstantial detail of a particular stage in the evolution of the Otago and Canterbury schemes of settlement, and also a few interesting scraps of information about the New Zealand Company's dealings with the Whig and Tory politicians of the day.

The change of government in 1846 brought hope to most protagonists of colonisation, but immediate disappointment to the Wakefields. Writes Jerningham Wakefield on 8 August 1846, after Gibbon Wakefield's failure to capture the ear of Earl Grey, the new Colonial Secretary: 'My poor father *very much* shaken by the great disappointment of Grey's most shameful backsliding — How can Lord Grey be such a fool as not to see the reputation he might gain by adopting EGW's views —'. Jerningham displayed a proper filial loyalty; father and son worked closely together.

Yet for all Jerningham Wakefield's name-dropping, he was, after all, only on the periphery of events. In the pages of his journal we catch glimpses of a few more important men — his father, Thackeray, Archbishop Whately — but only a few. For me, the principal interest of the Journal lies in two things: the examples it gives of the pressure group tactics of the Wakefields, and, far more absorbing, the picture it affords of a young man 'on the make' in the United Kingdom of the 1840s. Here is all the restless practical energy and curiosity of the Young Victorian Age, which spilled out into empire. The Journal is primarily a document of social history.

Professor Joan Stevens of the English Department at Victoria University has done a meticulous job of editing the difficult text. Hardly a name or an abbreviation seems to have managed to defy her efforts to track it down. Add to this thoroughness a happy choice of illustrations, a series of valuable genealogical tables, and a delightful map of London in 1843, and the result is a most interesting volume. Nevertheless, it must be said that the editor's introduction and extended notes, careful as they are, fail to place the Journal in clear historical context. What, after all, were the basic issues in the politics of colonisation at this time? Why were the Wakefields so interested and involved in Church settlements? Why precisely were the Wakefields so disappointed in Earl Grey? What was the social and political position of Jerningham Wakefield's family connections? How typical were the attitudes,

education, reading and general style of life which he reveals? How does the *Journal* compare with other contemporary accounts of London? Does it add anything to them? Answers to such questions as these would have enabled the reader to understand far better the significance of this new-found document, and widened its appeal. Yet Professor Stevens has done so much so well that such criticism seems ungrateful.

PETER STUART

*Eastbourne, Wellington*

*British Antislavery 1833-1870.* By Howard Temperley. Longman, London, 1972, xviii, 292 pp. U.K. price: £3.50.

DR TEMPERLEY'S new book represents some extension and some pruning of a Yale doctoral thesis on the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. His first two chapters are essentially preliminary. His real concern is with the antislavery movement after the end of the apprenticeship in 1838. One short chapter deals with a less familiar aspect of the subject, the gradual ending of legalized slavery in India and its end, more rapidly, in Ceylon. But the book is in the main a study of British public opinion. After emancipation the centre of interest moved back to the slave trade, this time the trade to foreign countries. By 1888 there were only two maritime nations outside the treaty system Britain had built up against the slave trade — Portugal and the United States. The latter, with its sensitiveness on maritime rights, was the main obstacle to the British Navy's operations against the trade. Fowell Buxton's remedy was to show the Africans a better way by establishing trading posts and model farms in the interior and negotiating treaties with African chiefs. But the disastrous failure of the Niger Expedition of 1841-42 discredited Buxton and his African Civilization Society and left the field free for Joseph Sturge and his Quaker friends who in 1839 had founded the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. An active campaign led to the formation, up and down the United Kingdom, of about a hundred auxiliaries of the Society; and in 1840 it sponsored a World Antislavery Convention in which not only the ex-slave colonies in the West Indies, Mauritius and Sierra Leone but Canada, the United States, France, Spain, Switzerland and Haiti were represented. The United States delegation split when the Convention decided not to admit women as delegates. W. L. Garrison refused to present his credentials and sat with the women in the gallery.

This was a portent of future trouble, but before discussing it Dr Temperley deals with the abolitionists' attitude towards the sugar colonies and the sugar duties in Britain. 'The sugar colonies' is a convenient phrase but it tends to simplify the problem. The soil, the amount of unoccupied land, the social situation varied from colony to colony and Dr Temperley's treatment hardly takes enough account of these diversities. The treatment of the sugar duties could also with advantage be somewhat fuller, although it does make the important point that this issue ranged the anti-slavery men and the free traders on different sides, since the former were opposed to admitting slave-grown sugar to the British market. This was the issue which brought the Melbourne ministry down in 1841. Peel altered the duties in 1844 to admit foreign free labour sugar on favourable terms and next year