

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

reminding us of the various media flourishing in the romantic period beyond our sometimes limited circumscription of it as an era of poetry first and foremost. In attending to class via his explication of these media instead of race, as Foucault does, Broglio grounds his book historically in a fashion that often eludes Foucault and that the ahistorical Agamben simply foregoes altogether. And, indeed, this grounding makes historical sense given the extensive processes underway throughout England during this time to enclose and redistribute land in order to ensure agricultural yield could supply a nation adequate food to keep its members alive (these were not strictly species concerns, then, but national ones invested in policing class boundaries even while “making live,” another blind spot in Foucault’s conceptualization).

The book is essentially organized into two groups of chapters, the first clutch of which deals with labor-class writing in the work of Robert Bloomfield, Robert Burns, and James Hogg (along with other figures like Thomas Batchelor and William Cobbett). While in those chapters Broglio performs fine readings of under-studied writers, in the second set of chapters he does truly innovative work, taking up the art of Thomas Bewick, George Stubbs, and Edward Landseer. Broglio’s study of Bewick and Stubbs proves highly illuminating as he turns to their “encyclopedic works on animals,” and these figures and texts represent the book’s shift from spotlighting humans as the objects of biopower in the works of the above-named peasant poets to highlight animals as the subjects of biopolitical defiance (67). As Broglio remarks in the chapter on Landseer, “what gets lost in the symbolization of the animal is the animal itself,” a process that, as Broglio argues, these artists refuse, using their illustrations and paintings instead as spaces that show how animals resist and evade “human mastery” (95, 68). Stubbs, for instance, emerges here as something of a Deleuze-and-Guattari type of theoretician and artist, thinking being beyond species in his non-static representations of humans and animals that can, and do, change and transform into other beings. That is, for Stubbs, as Broglio shows us, being is a process of becoming, which, as Broglio says, twists natural history into a medium that can be harnessed in opposition to state-run biopolitical processes meant to stake out clear species boundaries that privilege the human. Landseer’s work provides a way of connecting Broglio’s book to Gillen D’Arcy Wood’s *Tambora* (2015) and Siobhan Carroll’s *An Empire of Air and Water* (2015) in that all three discuss strange polar voyages like the Franklin expedition of 1845. Broglio’s interest lies in Landseer’s painting of the event, *Man Proposes, God Disposes* (1864), which depicts polar bears chomping down on the remains of the lost crew and demonstrates an anti-humanism that “disposes and levels the cultural intrusion of human history” into the inhuman mysterious land of the bears’ arctic home. These readings of romantic artwork open our eyes to how the visual aspects of overlooked romantic texts perform as retaliatory forces against human biopolitical apparatuses. It is at this point that the Broglio swerves into “Afterword: Romanticism in the Dust of This Planet,” a brief survey of some key canonical romantic poems and novels that think in terms of human-less and inhuman worlds. This chapter, while mainly a suggestive sketch, will dialogue well with other works forthcoming on speculative realism and romanticism.

Scholars interested in some of the ignored romantic poets and artists will find much of interest in this book, as will those who are continuing, like Broglio, to explore how to attenuate the effects of biopolitics on humans and animals alike, whether via new materialist feminism, post-humanism, or any of the various speculativisms that are flourishing at present. One of *Beasts of Burden*’s real strengths is that Broglio offers a new look at romanticism from unexpected vantages. From these prospects, the book does fulfill one of its larger stated aims to “question” the “basic concepts of Romantic scholarship concerning the individual and the citizen,” even while it is unclear whether the book does successfully question “the limits of history and historical scholarship and finally,” even, “the limits of reason” (14). In this regard, although the book does illuminatingly dwell with so-called minor figures in the romantic landscape, for this reviewer, it would need a lengthier treatment of the methodological and theoretical underpinnings within romanticism that ground what Broglio’s calls its “experiments” before it results in

a genuine “thinking Romanticism otherwise” (14). But this book is certainly an intriguing and successful-on-its-own-terms beginning to such a project.

Chris Washington
Francis Marion University
chris.washingtondc100@gmail.com

SIMON BROWN. *Cecil Hepworth and the Rise of the British Film Industry 1899–1911*. Exeter Studies in Film History. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2016. Pp. 256. \$100.00 (cloth). doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.213

In *Cecil Hepworth and the Rise of the British Film Industry 1899–1911*, Simon Brown paints a portrait of early filmmaker and producer Cecil M. Hepworth and a picture of the emerging British film industry during the Edwardian era. Apprehensive of broad approaches to film history, Brown instead equips himself with a fine brush, similar to those used in the early days of cinema for coloring films frame by frame. This strategy allows him to fill in the minute details and highlight the peripheral areas in historical accounts that otherwise might be easily (dis)missed. Brown’s chosen mode aligns well with such methodologies as Foucauldian genealogy and media archaeology (Erkki Huhtamo and Jussi Parikka), a turn to “the new film history,” and a recent approach to “film history as media archaeology” (Thomas Elsaesser). These trends offer novel perspectives, dislocating accepted conceptions of history and revealing inconsistencies in evolutionary outlines of cultural ontogenesis. Similarly, in this book and his other writings, Brown attempts to complicate our notions of history, searching for absences, gaps, and suppressions in the historical chart. His revisionist methodology resists explanatory grand narratives, bringing to light minor histories and micro-stories.

In *Cecil Hepworth*, Brown focuses in particular on the period in British film from 1904 to 1911, years declared “depressing” and “stagnant” by such film historians as Georges Sadoul, Rachael Low, and Charles Barr. According to Barr, British film pioneers “ran the first lap, passed on the baton to the Americans, and then stopped exhausted” (“Before *Blackmail*: Silent British Cinema,” in *The British Cinema Book*, ed. Robert Murphy, 2009, 148). Brown, who quotes Barr’s statement in an opening epigraph, argues that this account is far from exhaustive, reinstating a vision of 1904–11 as a period of important changes and setting out to prove that the British film industry during these formative years was marked by its own pace. Brown further suggests that the pejorative attitude dominating the discussions of this phase can be partially attributed to the perpetuation of the *pioneer myth*. Early filmmakers, such as James Williamson, Robert Paul, George Albert Smith, and Cecil Hepworth have been cast as visionary but amateurish innovators. Hepworth, the son of a magic-lanternist, reinforced this conception of himself in his memoirs, *Came the Dawn: Memories of a Film Pioneer* (1951). Contrary to this somewhat biased account, Brown chooses to describe the “Master Mind of the House of Hepworth” (to borrow a 1919 title from Gertrude M. Allen) as much more practical and pragmatic. Hepworth started his company in 1899 and went out of business by 1924. As opposed to Williamson and Paul, who were forced to leave film production due to its crisis, Hepworth persevered and tried to adapt his business to the changing industry. In order to espouse this redemptive vision of Hepworth, Brown describes the role of his company, Hepworth Manufacturing Company, Ltd., within the three sectors of the film industry: production, distribution, and exhibition.

Brown’s opening chapter offers a balanced account of Hepworth’s activities in film production. The profits from early actualities such as *Funeral of Queen Victoria* (1901) and *The Coronation of King Edward VII* (1902) prompted the company’s move to more active film production. Hepworth’s London sales office in Cecil Court (nicknamed Flicker Alley due to