

with his chapter on architecture and empire in Britain, which addresses the recent interest in empire “at home.” The debates and concepts of imperial history are, however, strikingly absent from much of the book. The contribution that the study of built environments might make to the historiography of empire, and vice versa, is not the main concern of most contributors.

This is reflected, for example, in the marginal place of colonized people in many chapters. The role of “collaboration,” crucial to the making and unmaking of British power, is a staple of historians of empire. Here, it is well addressed by Preeti Chopra in her chapter on South and South East Asia, which is fully alive to the role of colonized people “as users, designers, engineers, builders, and sometimes patrons” (278). Ian Lochhead and Peter Walker’s chapter on New Zealand offers some interesting coverage of the effects of British settlement on Maori architectures; and twentieth-century non-British architects, including the Sri Lankan Minnette de Siva and the Nigerians Adedokun Adeyemi and Olumide Olumuyiwa, feature briefly in other chapters. But the book engages only sporadically with how the everyday lives of colonized people invariably remade urban space and invested it with new meanings.

This issue might be addressed through a more sustained study of buildings’ use and representation. Not traditionally a question that has attracted architectural historians’ interest, the consideration of how colonized people used and appropriated built environments would allow us to develop a more multifaceted understanding of colonial-era urban space. It is striking that buildings intended to express and uphold British power, like those at New Delhi, ultimately failed to do so. This failure is best explained by locating them within wider histories of empire.

That said, Bremner offers an invaluable and unprecedented survey of a new and exciting field of imperial history that should mark its coming of age. The volume’s importance for many will be as an entry point to this almost endlessly rich arena of study: it surely contains the seeds of hundreds of dissertation topics. Bremer and his contributors have given us a dazzling and abundant survey. The full importance of the field they have delineated will only become clear in the years to come.

Tim Livsey
 Leeds Beckett University
T.R.Livsey@leedsbeckett.ac.uk

ANDRÉ BRETT *Acknowledge No Frontier: The Creation and Demise of New Zealand’s Provinces, 1853–76*. Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2016. Pp. 343. \$35.99 (paper).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.211

In 1853, New Zealand, by the imperial parliament’s New Zealand Constitution Act, established a quasi-federal system by which authority was shared between provincial governments (six originally) and the colonial government based in Auckland. The provinces were not like British municipalities, though they had elective councils modelled on the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act. Their wide powers included immigration and public works, especially railway construction. In 1858, they were given a substantial share of the revenue accruing from the disposal of crown lands.

André Brett’s *Acknowledge No Frontier: The Creation and Demise of New Zealand’s Provinces, 1853–76* is a timely book, not least because it might serve to revive interest in the politics of the New Zealand colonial society, much neglected over the last half-century apart from the occasional biography of high-strutting premiers and the like. More important, this is the first comprehensive treatment of the subject since W. P. Morrell’s *The Provincial System in New Zealand*

(1932)—reprinted in 1964 to make the point of its continued indispensability. It is good that Brett is generous towards his now long-gone predecessor. The wealth of material Brett deploys (about 450 items are listed in the bibliography) indicates well how within a lifetime there has been a huge expansion of available sources and writing on New Zealand history. Neither has Brett let the embarrassment of riches obscure the overall argument of his work. In the concluding chapter, there are even several pages of useful reflection on whether local government after the abolition of the provinces.

Brett, fairly enough, sees the demise of the provincial system as sooner or later inevitable. Governor Grey, as its chief architect and promoter, was responding to a situation where, however small in area New Zealand was in comparison to Australia or Canada, the six main European settlements existed in virtual isolation from each other, separated by bush and mountain and by precarious sea links along the country's stormy coasts. Colonists, too, were understandably focused on local development, and from the Britain of their own time took full possession of the idea of local self-government to press the point. Trouble was that there was never enough money to meet the requirements, let alone expectations, of settlers who wanted roads, bridges, railways, and port facilities. Of all the provinces, only Canterbury, generously recompensed out of the crown's land revenues, could make a go of it.

Things came to a head in the late 1860s, when the obvious truth dawned that the London money market was extremely wary of lending large amounts to the provinces. The colonial government stepped to the fore when Julius Vogel, a political entrepreneur if ever there was one, took office as colonial treasurer and later premier with a policy of raising loans to fund large-scale immigration and public works, the very matters on which the provinces had failed to deliver. Earlier, the building of a telegraph system by central government had shown the possibilities of colonial integration. Provincial shortcomings and central initiative finally ensured the passage of an abolition act in 1875, confirmed by a decisive election result a few months later.

Brett's solid achievement apart, another book remains to be written on the politics of the period. His account of the failure of the provincial system emphasizes the advance of colonial government authority, thereby implicitly contributing to the established interpretation of state formation in New Zealand and the continuing rise of the central state after 1876 until today, when ministers exercise "unbridled power" (G. W. R. Palmer, *Unbridled Power: An Interpretation of New Zealand's Constitution and Government*, 1979). An alternative view places importance on the relationship between the localities and provincial governments and points towards a post-1876 equilibrium of local and central authority by which the latter left the former a generous measure of self-government supported by permissive legislation and financial handouts—subsidies, grants, and loans—with minimal conditions directing on what projects the money should be spent. Previously, the provincial governments had recognized the force of colonial localism by creating and funding road boards—some three hundred existed in 1876. Several municipalities had also been constituted before the New Zealand parliament passed the 1867 Municipal Corporations Act, which set up town governments that were to a high degree self-reliant for the next three-quarters of a century—much of the development in the largest centers was funded by overseas loans negotiated by councils. Brett gives the boroughs negligible attention, though town dwellers were just as avid for town amenities as country settlers were for roads and bridges.

The model of the state, then, that had most influence in nineteenth-century New Zealand, and arguably the empire, was not the continental one of firm centralized control but the British one of self-governing local or subnational bodies empowered to take charge of whatever the central state could do less effectively. A premium was put on satisfying local wants and using local resources as far as was practicable. Call it a cynical ploy to curry favor with localists if you will, but the payments made to provincial governments for distribution to the road boards commenced in 1870 by Vogel the centralist also fully acknowledged realities. The

idea of local self-government was perfectly evident in New Zealand's provincial system, and it had equal resonance in the county and borough system that succeeded it.

J. E. Cookson
University of Canterbury
jpcookson@xtra.co.nz

RON BROGLIO. *Beasts of Burden: Biopolitics, Labor, and Animal Life in British Romanticism*. SUNY Series, Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2017. Pp. 163. \$80.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.212

Unlike some books that take on the subject of literature and biopolitics only to forget about the former in a deep dive into the latter, Ron Broglio's newest book, *Beasts of Burden: Biopolitics, Labor, and Animal Life in British Romanticism*, remains firmly focused on romantic-era writing and art even while it expands our understanding of Foucauldian biopolitics. And for Broglio, it is decidedly the Foucauldian brand of biopolitics rather than the Agambenian that is worth examination, mainly because "Foucault's early work on disciplinary societies accounts for the regulation of labor practices as a regulation of bodies" (6). Foucault of course located the origins of biopower and biopolitics in the Enlightenment, arguing that its technologies of discipline and regulation marked a transition from an old-guard identification of humans as individual bodies to modernity's realization of "man-as-species" and a new investment in the state's ability to "make live or let die" in order to manage and perpetuate the species' continuance (7, 5). While modern climate change studies reveal the gaping fantasy of Foucault's claims—it is because humans do not self-conceptualize as a species that they find themselves unable to globally battle climate change—Foucault's account of biopolitics, as Broglio points out, does offer an astute framework for understanding labor practices in the English countryside during the romantic and post-romantic periods. *Beasts of Burden* departs from Foucault's biopolitics, though, in that it toils in another of Foucault's blindspots: as Broglio puts it, "what [Foucault] leaves out—but what I take up in this book—is how food and the labor of producing it are also implicated in biopower, and particularly so during the early formation of the biopolitical systems in Britain" (7).

Broglio's book intersects with Nicole Shukin's *Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times* (2009) and Cary Wolfe's *Before the Law: Humans and Other Animals in a Biopolitical Frame* (2013), both of which have done much to think through the tendency of biopolitics to include animals (paradoxically) by means of their exclusion. Animals are crucial to the human species' life, but their biopolitical industrialized slaughter is justified precisely because they are not part of the human species. Building on and extending Shukin's and Wolfe's work, in Broglio's words, his "project considers how the life and liveness of the subject resists and exceeds the frameworks used to render subjects units of operation within the *dispositif* of capital and state" (8). "The goal," he tells us, "is to find moments early in the formation of biopolitics where other modalities of living and dwelling were at odds with the biopolitical regime that continues to the present" (8). Broglio discovers such moments of defiance in the poetry and artwork of British romanticism, specifically the laboring class peasants and the animals they put to work (his examples are horses and sheep dogs) as well as "lions and polar bears that do social and political work through their wildness" (8). In focusing on both literature and visual art from the period, Broglio continues the work begun in his earlier books, *Technologies of the Picturesque* (2008) and *Surface Encounters: Thinking with Animals and Art* (2011), deepening our knowledge of artists in the period while