

only foreign visitor to describe the insanitary slums in which the poorest workers – many of them Irish immigrants – lived under disgusting conditions.

*W. O. Henderson, Hemel Hempstead*

Stanley H. Palmer, *Police and Protest in England and Ireland, 1780–1850*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988, pp. XXIV, 824, bound, £ 30.00.

The industrial revolution in England was accompanied by the establishment of factories, the growth of population, and the expansion of large towns. The Gordon riots of 1780 showed that the traditional method of combating crime could not cope with the new situation. Neither special constables nor the volunteers nor the regular army could be relied upon to deal with the threatened breakdown of law and order. Eventually the parish constable would have to give way to the modern policeman.

Accounts of the establishment of the London police force in 1829 generally start with a discussion of earlier attempts at reform such as John Fielding's foot patrol of 1773 and the Thames river police established by Patrick Colquhoun and John Marriott in 1798 to combat pilfering in the docks. It is the great merit of Professor Palmer's detailed survey on the early history of the police force in England that he shows how police reforms in Ireland paved the way for police reform in England. This is surprising since social unrest in England was very different from social unrest in Ireland. In England – though there were agrarian outrages in 1830 – the maintenance of law and order was largely an urban problem. However in Ireland – where the Protestant minority oppressed the Catholic majority – outrages were endemic in the countryside. Murders and mainings were all too common. Witnesses were intimidated so that it was very difficult to bring criminals to justice.

An early attempt to check agrarian disturbances in Ireland was the establishment of a rural police force first in Cork, Kerry, Kilkenny and Tipperary (1787) and then in most other counties. A police force was established in Dublin in 177 and reorganised in 1808. In England, on the other hand, attempts at this time to establish a police force in London were frustrated by opponents who associated police forces with absolutist governments on the Continent. The efficient armed police of Paris and the French provinces were regarded with deep suspicion in England. Lacking a modern police force the authorities had to rely upon soldiers and volunteers to deal with emergencies such as the Luddite movement (1811–12).

Robert Peel, Irish Chief Secretary between 1812 and 1818, was determined to tackle the intractable problem of agrarian outrages in Ireland. He established the armed Peace Preservation Police, first in Tipperary and then in other districts in which disorders were rife. His successors – Charles Grant and Leveson Gower – extended the activities of the Irish police. When Peel became Home Secretary he founded the metropolitan police force in 1829. In doing so he was clearly influenced by his previous experience in setting up a police force in Ireland. When dealing with the gradual extension of police forces in the provinces in England, Professor Palmer covers familiar ground. His admirable survey ends in 1850, two years after the London police – assisted by special constables – had prevented Chartist demonstrators from marching on Parliament.

*W. O. Henderson, Hemel Hempstead*

John Davis, *Reforming London. The London Government Problem 1855–1900* (= Oxford Historical Monographs), Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press 1988, pp. XI, 203, clothbound, £ 29.50.

Since the earliest times there have been two Londons – the City and the surrounding built-up area. The City covered only one square mile. It was not a centre of government –

that was in neighbouring Westminster – but it was London's business and financial centre and its Lord Mayor came to be regarded as the first citizen of the capital. To this day it is still the Lord Mayor who entertains distinguished foreign visitors. It has never been found possible to integrate the City into the rest of London.

The growth of London's population – about two million in the middle of the nineteenth century – led to attempts to introduce some order into its chaotic administration. Professor Davis has examined these efforts to reform the government of London between 1855 and 1900. In 1855 it was felt that the size of the capital and the great diversity of its various communities made it desirable to introduce a two tier system of administration. The top tier would include organisations which would have overall responsibility for functions common to the whole capital. It included the Metropolitan Board of Works (lighting, paving, sanitation, parks etc), the police (administered by the Home office), the Asylums Board and (later) the School Board. The second (or lower) tier consisted of a number of small organisations which would administer purely local affairs. These were 78 parish vestries, 55 of which were amalgamated into 15 district boards.

An attempt to improve this two tier system was made when the Local Government Act of 1888 created a new top tier of administration. This was a directly elected county authority – the London County Council. But the independence of the City was maintained and the police continued to be administered by the Home Office. The second tier authorities – the vestries and district boards – survived. In 1899, however, the vestries and district boards were abolished and replaced by 28 municipal boroughs.

Professor Davis' examination of the gradual reform of the government of London is a sure guide to a complex problem and it is to be hoped that the author will continue his researches into the twentieth century – indeed to 1986 when the Greater London Council (successor of the London County Council) was abolished and many of its powers were transferred to the boroughs.

*W. O. Henderson, Hemel Hempstead*

Eugen Wendler, Friedrich List. Politische Wirkungsgeschichte des Vordenkers der europäischen Integration, R. Oldenbourg Verlag, München 1989, 238 S., Ln., 78 DM.

The 200th anniversary of the birth of Friedrich List has been marked by celebration in his birthplace Reutlingen and by several conferences organised by learned societies. It is appropriate that a new book on List by Professor Wendler should appear in 1989. The title is a little misleading since only Part 4 – 38 pages – is concerned with List as an early advocate of a European common market. Part 1 is devoted to statesmen with whom List was in contact. In Part 2 the author deals mainly with the influence of List's doctrines on various statesmen such as Bismarck and Witte. The essay on King Ludwig of Bavaria would have been more appropriate in Part 1 rather than in Part 2. In Part 3 Professor Wendler examines the reception of List's doctrines in India and Japan and in Part 4 he discusses List's view on the economic integration of Europe.

On some of the topics examined in this book Professor Wendler has little new to offer his readers. The sketch of List's life, the activities of the Union of Merchants, the founding of the Zollverein and the proposed Anglo-German alliance have been discussed by many historians. And occasionally the excitement of finding a new document has led the author to write at undue length on topics of little importance such as the second thoughts of the King of Bavaria in the matter of an honour for List and the curious but quite unimportant episode of List's appointment as American consul in Württemberg. On the other hand the merit of the book lies in the examination of some of those with whom List was in contact (Part 1) and the influence of List's ideas on later generations (Part 2).