

“race-based localism” (38) she transforms, as Hack shows, into an engagement with anti-slavery politics; or James McCune Smith’s provocative charge that Tennyson plagiarized “The Charge of the Light Brigade” from an African battle song that inspired the Haitian revolutionaries.

What becomes clear when encountering this new kind of archive is the long backstory that precedes it. Hack draws on decades of work in several fields to make visible the literary and editorial practices (and their transatlantic circulations) that he considers. Poststructural concepts of intertextuality and paratext, New Historicist emphases on context and ideological import, and systematic analyses of reception studies and book history make it possible for Hack to treat his materials as aspects of an intentional strategy of cultural invention and reinvention. What might once have been dismissed as ephemera (such as the citational allegory in a late lecture of Du Bois), samples of editorial piracy (the serial republication of *Bleak House* in *Douglass’s Paper*), or simply clumsy plagiarisms become, in Hack’s deft account, mutually illuminating transformations of one culture by another. Moreover, his primary tool for articulating this transformation, “close reading at a distance,” takes on current critical orthodoxies that demand a stark methodological choice: either perform a (more or less outmoded) close formal reading of the text, or create an historically informed description of a context that reframes the cultural and ideological import of the text. In *Reaping Something New*, Hack will have it both ways.

“Close reading at a distance” allows Hack to “risk” (7) (as he puts it) the kind of patient, sensitive attention to the text that can yield startling insights—as with Hack’s reading of how Pauline Hopkins’s insertion of one word, “hope,” changes entirely the political valence of a passage from Tennyson she puts to new purpose in her first novel, *Contending Forces* (1900). Conversely, the “distance” of Hack’s close reading—a distance that implies both the historical and transatlantic scope of his archive and the reception-oriented historicism that informs his work—generates some of the most significant contributions Hack makes in *Reaping Something New*, including a new account of Chesnutt’s career-long engagement with Victorian literature; a trenchant analysis of Pauline Hopkins’s dialogue with and relation to Chesnutt articulated by way of the “meta-citations” of Tennyson that they both used; and a convincing revision of long-standing accounts of W. E. B. Dubois’s “dual epigraphs” and what they reveal about the relation of culture and politics in *The Souls of Black Folk*. Along with Hack’s new readings of *Bleak House*, of Tennyson, and of George Eliot’s tales of “unwitting passing and voluntary affiliation” (17), *Reaping Something New* makes good on its promise that attention to the African Americanizing of Victorian literature will illuminate the articulation (or disarticulation) of race in both cultures. Its most lasting contribution, though, may be the way it shows us how distance can bring us closer to the objects of our attention, and, conversely, how such closeness can help ensure that distance does not flatten or diminish our view.

Charles Baraw
Southern Connecticut State University
barawc1@southernct.edu

JAMES HEARTFIELD. *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1838–1956: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. xii + 486. \$65.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.221

In 1838, British anti-slavery stood at a crossroads. Having succeeded in bringing slavery in the British West Indies to an end, British activists might have been forgiven for disbanding. Instead, they set out on a new venture, this time aimed at internationalizing abolition, or

“universal emancipation.” Their chosen vehicle was the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, or BFASS, organized in 1839, which was to prove the most enduring of all British anti-slavery organizations; indeed, it survives to this day in the shape of Anti-Slavery International. Despite its obvious importance, especially to those interested in the history of humanitarianism, very little scholarly attention has been paid to the BFASS. Howard Temperley tackled its early history in his 1972 monograph, *British Anti-Slavery, 1833–1870*, but little has been published since. Now, in what is a landmark study, James Heartfield has produced a new history of the organization that is impressive in its scale and ambition.

Heartfield begins *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1838–1956: A History* with an account of the origins of the BFASS, followed by chapters on slave trade diplomacy, the fate of post-emancipation societies in the British West Indies, and efforts to abolish slavery in the United States and Cuba—concerns that preoccupied the society through the middle decades of the nineteenth century, really up to 1870. In part two he shifts his attention, as the BFASS did, to Africa and the Middle East, setting the society’s campaigning, especially its suppression of the East African slave trade, within the wider context of the “scramble for Africa.” Then, in part three, “The Colonial Labour Question,” Heartfield takes the story up to 1956, when the BFASS scaled back its operations, discussing along the way the society’s somewhat conflicted position over King Leopold’s Congo Free State, as well as its role in helping to sell the Native Land Act in South Africa, which many regard as the foundation of apartheid. As these few details suggest, Heartfield does not spare the BFASS’s blushes; on the contrary, one of the great strengths of his book is his determination to unpack the society’s entangled history, while at the same time allowing activists to “speak in their own voices about the things that concerned them” (viii). Understandably, notions of empire loom large in this story, but so, too, do economic interests, the prospect of legitimate trade with Africa and, in the case of the American Civil War, rampant anti-Americanism.

Specialists will be familiar with many aspects of Heartfield’s narrative. Nevertheless, his synoptic approach pays dividends, not least in allowing us to see how the BFASS evolved from an “out-of-doors” organization into “an incorporated part of policy formation” (viii). There is much to admire here. Heartfield’s case studies are thoughtful and compelling. His detailed analysis of the BFASS’s position during the American Civil War, when the society opposed the Union war effort, explicitly supporting the demand for secession of the Southern states, is a model of clarity. Equally compelling is his discussion of the role of Charles Harris Allen, secretary of the BFASS from 1879 to 1898, in reorganizing the society and reorienting it towards East Africa, a shift that brought it into much closer contact with the Colonial Office and with the crown. Heartfield’s judgements are shrewd and insightful. He also makes excellent use of biographical method, in the process highlighting the importance of religious and social networks, particularly within the BFASS’s central (London) committee. Only occasionally does his analysis falter, most notably in his chapter on the two world wars, where he tends to gloss over important changes at an international level in the definition and meaning of slavery. It also has to be said that many modern anti-slavery activists might take issue with his bold assertion that “slavery has today largely been abolished” (425).

While impressive in its grasp of detail, Heartfield’s book is essentially an institutional history, based largely on the BFASS’s annual (published) reports and its official organ, the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. By his own admission, Heartfield has not consulted the society’s manuscript minutes or its voluminous correspondence, both readily accessible in the Weston Library in Oxford. This might be thought not to matter a great deal, but it means that we get little sense how the BFASS interacted with its supporters, or how it operated as an organization that at its peak had more than two hundred regional and local auxiliaries. Neither do we get much sense how the BFASS was perceived by others, including the press, or how it was able to sustain itself in the competitive humanitarian market. (This last point is all the more pertinent, given the BFASS’s inconsistent and sometimes controversial positions on subjects as diverse as West Indian sugar duties and Abraham Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation).

Nevertheless, Heartfield's thoughtful and illuminating study will be of obvious interest to students and scholars alike. Readable and accessible, *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1838–1956* is an important book that is likely to become the standard history of what is rightly regarded as the first international human rights organization in the world.

J. R. Oldfield
University of Hull
John.Oldfield@hull.ac.uk

EMILY JONES. *Edmund Burke and the Invention of Modern Conservatism, 1830–1914: An Intellectual History*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. 273. \$90.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.194

One of the many merits of Emily Jones's *Edmund Burke and the Invention of Modern Conservatism, 1830–1914* is that Jones compresses the fundamentals of its thesis into its title. She argues that modern "C/conservatism" (1)—upper-case denoting the party political affiliation, lower-case the intellectual tradition—was invented in the nineteenth century, and that Edmund Burke came to be understood, in important respects, as its inventor. Jones explores how this happened: How was it that an eighteenth-century Whig litterateur, politician and orator came to be seen as having articulated a coherent political theory of C/conservatism? The central question here, then, is bracingly simple. Jones's answer is anything but, sprawling across politics, philosophy, and education, and welding these fields together in new configurations.

It is not easy to epitomize Jones's argument in a way that does justice to its range. Its center of gravity lies in the later decades of the nineteenth century: before then, Jones explains, Burke's fame rested principally on his literary style and his quotable hymns to the constitution. From the 1860s, however, Burke became a subject of serious scholarly attention, notably from the Liberal critics John Morley and Leslie Stephen. Even more importantly, in the 1880s he became a widely cited authority in the debates over Irish Home Rule, in part because Gladstone insisted that he ought to be. Rhetorical battles raged thereafter over how Burke ought to be read, but he was appropriated most successfully by Liberal Unionists, whose departure to sit alongside the Conservatives was a critical development. It meant that as C/conservatives began to search for ways of invigorating and reframing their political creed, Burke had become a more plausible resource to draw upon. At the same time, he assumed a more prominent role in educational curricula, and in academic studies of political philosophy, helped along by an emerging consensus that political modernity and the contemporary party system had their origins in the era of the French Revolution. By the eve of the Great War, Burke had been established—though never entirely without challenge—as a pillar of C/conservatism. Tracing the path towards this apotheosis also involves excursions into Irishness, Idealism, the Indian Civil Service, and a host of other issues and institutions.

Jones's book, as this summary suggests, is by no means a traditional history of political thought. It is about public discourse in the broadest sense, and Jones bases her analysis on a wide variety of printed sources, from political journalism to philosophical treatises to calendars of evening classes. She offers by turns in-depth analyses of pivotal texts and speeches and wider sampling from reviews, pamphlets, and Hansard. She deals with a topic of obvious importance in a consistently illuminating fashion, aiming to show how established party doctrines and entrenched assumptions rendered certain readings of Burke's ideas particularly persuasive. Creative reinterpretations of the careers of political giants were fundamental to the rhetorics of