

Bolshevik commissars is also detailed. She endorses Brian Pearce's conclusion that Teague-Jones's direct involvement, captured in film and on the canvas for "Soviet martyrology," (134) was fabricated. Further information is also given about his employment with the British Security Coordination.

On the whole, Ter Minassian's industry has certainly been worthwhile, but some reservations are necessary. The book sits rather uneasily between a popular work and a work of scholarship. If regarded as a scholarly work, the earlier chapters especially are occasionally speculative and well padded, with certain distracting mannerisms of style. In spite of the acknowledged paucity of documentary sources concerning Teague-Jones's wartime service in pursuit of William Wassmuss, the chapter on that subject extends to over twenty pages. There is also a lack of precision on some points, notably Teague-Jones's linguistic proficiency (18, 27). There is a reference to the intended "re-conquest" of southern Persia by British forces during the First World War (55). Britain had not previously conquered it. There is also a lack of effective contextualization of some issues and odd omissions in terms of secondary reading. Reference to Jennifer Sigel's *Endgame* (2002), among other sources, would have helped to set the scene of Anglo-Russian relations in Persia and Central Asia before 1914. Also, with reference to the Indian Political Intelligence Service, she would have benefited from reading Richard Poppowell's book, *Intelligence and Imperial Defence: British Intelligence and the Defence of the Indian Empire, 1904–1924* (1995). More bewildering, in connection with Teague-Jones's period in Transcaspia, is the lack of systematic use of the Political and Secret Department's files of the India Office, where some of Sinclair's own papers are held, and, more importantly, those of the successive committees under Lord Curzon, which oversaw British involvement in Transcaspia and discussed it in detail. The lack of systematic research has led to another surprising omission: Teague-Jones's apparent employment by the Secret Intelligence Service immediately after the First World War. No connection is made between his employment as a refugee officer among Russians displaced by civil war and the need of the British authorities for intelligence about developments in Russia. While useful detail is provided on the careers of some individuals who crop up in connection with Teague-Jones, such as Vivian Gabriel, others, such as Sir Arthur Hirtzel (31, 56), are referred to in the text without any explanation as to their position and then, in Hirtzel's case, wrongly identified as a Foreign Office official (168). Also, there are occasional instances of repetition.

However, such reservations aside, Ter Minassian's book adds much interesting detail to our understanding of Reginald Teague-Jones.

*John Fisher*, University of the West of England

KARL ITTMANN. *A Problem of Great Importance: Population, Race, and Power in the British Empire, 1918–1973*. Berkeley Series in British Studies 7. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013. Pp. 299. \$39.95 (paper).  
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.60

Karl Ittmann's *A Problem of Great Importance: Population, Race, and Power in the British Empire, 1918–1973* is an important study, impressive in its chronological range and geographical scope. Ittmann addresses the question of population control in the modern British Empire, reviewing both imperial strategies across a variety of colonial settings and domestic debates around Commonwealth immigration and integration. In doing so, his analysis reflects two now-established trends within the study of colonial history: an attempt to focus simultaneously on metropolitan and peripheral contexts, and an interest in the transition from the imperial to the postimperial. This book though will appeal not only to historians of Britain and the empire during the

twentieth century but also to researchers interested in the relationship between pressure groups and scientists on the one hand, and government on the other. Ittmann's examination of the emergence of demography as a social science is an intellectual but above all an institutional history, one that traces the links between lobbyists, academics, nongovernmental organizations, charitable foundations, and national and international agencies. This is perhaps the book's greatest contribution.

In the first section of the book, Ittmann seeks to explain the marginality of demography within imperial policymaking and colonial practice before the 1940s. Ittmann observes how surprising this was, given that early modern Britain had developed the principles of political arithmetic in the settlement of Ireland, and, as the smallest of Europe's major powers, was intently aware of the significance of demographic trends. Even the South African War of 1899–1902, which raised concerns about the virility of the British population at home and abroad, failed to stimulate sustained investment targeted at affecting or even measuring demographic trends across the empire. Between the wars, however, population control did become a subject of intense debate in relation to colonial territories. Ittmann discusses the roles played by academic demographers, advocates of birth control, and eugenicists in this controversy, arguing that members of the Eugenics Society, well resourced and networked, played the key role in the development of the subdiscipline of colonial demography. Their conviction that growing colonial populations threatened both global prosperity and the international supremacy of the white race would survive, in diluted form, long after eugenics itself faded from public discourse.

The core of the study focuses on the middle decades of the twentieth century, a period when discussion of population control shifted from interest groups to the heart of government. Ittmann notes the ability of population control to appeal to a number of constituencies within the late colonial system, including a new generation of technocratic, socially progressive officials such as Andrew Cohen, head of the Africa Department within the Colonial Office. Population control for imperial reformers was above all about economic development. If colonial populations continued to expand rapidly, efforts to enhance living standards “would be pouring money down a bottomless sink” (102). There existed then support for the limitation of colonial population growth across the British political spectrum, yet colonial governments' impact on demographic trends was negligible. In part this was the consequence of earlier underinvestment in healthcare infrastructure and education, so that local administrations believed that a universal program of birth control provision would be impossible to implement. It reflected also the skepticism of central direction and expertise that characterized this decentralized empire to its end. Above all, though, it stemmed from nervousness about local opposition. British officials feared that indigenous elites would provoke mass anticolonial protest by claiming that population control was a racially motivated intervention, aimed at sustaining Western domination. As Ittmann shows, such claims would have been largely justified, even in the final days of empire. This then constituted one of the many paradoxes of late imperialism: population increase rendered colonial rule unsustainably expensive, but efforts to contain such growth were obstructed by fears of anticolonial nationalism. Enduring racism limited empire's power to persuade.

British rhetorical incapacity was highlighted by the growing body of American population scientists who came to dominate the field (thanks to superior funding and their influential development of demographic transition theory) after 1945; their universalism contrasted with the assumption within colonial demography that westerners' reproductive cultures were fundamentally different from non-Europeans'. American demographers condemned British imperialism for interfering with the natural progression of demographic transition, first by artificially reducing mortality rates through coercive systems of famine and epidemic control, and second by deliberately obstructing the industrialization and social modernization that would activate fertility limitation by personal choice. Their solution, the replacement of imperialism with new forms of international agency capable of stimulating and satisfying a demand

for contraception among the poor of the developing world, won the day. As Ittmann shows, however, the entrenchment of population control within international aid was accompanied by the mass migration of former officials of empire to the United Nations, bilateral agencies such as the Ministry of Overseas Development, and a host of nongovernmental organizations, where colonial knowledge and contacts, freed from the racial overtones of imperialism, could now be used to maximum effect.

In sum, this is a fine book, based on extensive archival research, which draws out connections between British political culture at home and in the empire. Its dual perspective appears most clearly in its analysis of ethnically motivated migration policy. Just as British officials strove to avoid explicit statements of intent domestically, so the colonial office sought to quietly manage migration and resettlement in the Indian Ocean islands, Palestine, Kenya, and Malaya where, typically, policy aimed to control the ethnic balance by “restricting Chinese immigration ... without saying so” (123).

Like all good books, this one should stimulate new research. Scholars interested in how local cultures of reproduction across the empire were shaped (or misshaped) by colonial and post-colonial interventions, the extent to which such cultures endured following migration to the United Kingdom, and the contrasts between the British experience and that of other imperial powers should all refer to this study.

*Shane Doyle*, University of Leeds

TAKASHI ITO. *London Zoo and the Victorians, 1828–1859*. Royal Historical Society Studies in History, New Series. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014. Pp. 204. \$90.00 (cloth). doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.61

Takashi Ito's important new book on the early years of the London Zoo situates its history among the histories of urban leisure, public science, and animal history. He focuses his analysis upon “how the zoo mediated between the scientific community and the non-specialist public” (166). En route, Ito places the London Zoo within the many discourses of imperial, metropolitan, and intellectual history that influenced its founding and first three decades. Ito is scrupulous in documenting the cultural politics of everything from the zoo's residence in Regent's Park (and resultant fears of noise and animal filth) to the increasingly pressing, social-class inflected question of access to the zoo. The great variety of his sources, which range from the Zoological Society's minutes to personal diaries both foreign and domestic of the zoo's visitors, is fascinating. The one area in which readers familiar with larger philosophical discourses of animal studies might wish for more historical narrative is animal history.

In his introduction, Ito remarks promisingly upon the topic of animal agency: “Theoretically, the application of the term ‘animal history’ would suggest a reassessment of a human-centered view of history and a discussion of the possibility of recovering the agency of animals in historical narratives” (14). He relates a kangaroo's apparent suicide, quoting a line from the Zoological Society of London's records, “Occurrences in the Garden,” on 22 October 1830: “killed itself against the fence of the padock [*sic*]” (36). There seems to be no record in Ito's sources about the kangaroo's capture or treatment, but Ito does provide fascinating details of animal capture in relation to the predecessors of four giraffes who were a cause célèbre at the London Zoo in May of 1826: French trader George Thibout of Cairo “captured five giraffes in Kurdufan (Kordofan) in the central region of what is now Sudan, but four of them died as a result of the severe winter on the way back to Angola (Dunkulah) in north Sudan” (66). Animal suffering and animal death are a part of the history Ito writes, and he does