

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

A Man and an Institution: Sir Maurice Hankey, the Cabinet Secretariat, and the Custody of Cabinet Secrecy. By Jason P. Naylor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Pp. xi -l- 419. Endnotes, bibliography, index. \$59.50.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5tr0h704>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 6(0)

Author

Leslie, Van M.

Publication Date

1985

Copyright Information

Copyright 1985 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

policies from above rather than enthusiasm from below, he misses one whole side of the movement.

Had he looked more closely, he might have found a more complex picture of the American Communist Party. For many, Communism was an attractive alternative to welfare capitalism because it answered the concerns of a floundering nation. Its unemployed councils, its union activities, and its anti-fascist rhetoric appealed to groups the New Deal did not always reach; "it urged life to believe in life," according to one former member. To this rank-and-file, directives from Russia meant less than the Party's daily activities, and while Comintern policy certainly proscribed a very clear set of limits on American policy, there was still room for creativity and for adaptation to American circumstances. Klehr never really asks what motivated the average Party member to make sacrifices for the revolution, a question which might have yielded a very different book.

To its credit, *The Heyday of American Communism* is carefully researched and well documented, and it provides a useful and much needed institutional history of the American Communist Party in the 1930s. It is, however, an incomplete accounting of the Party's appeal, its supporters, and its own unique place in American history.

Judy Kutulas

University of California, Los Angeles

A Man and an Institution: Sir Maurice Hankey, the Cabinet Secretariat, and the Custody of Cabinet Secrecy. By JASON P. NAYLOR. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Pp. xi + 419. Endnotes, bibliography, index. \$59.50.

For more than two decades as secretary to the British Cabinet and the Committee of Imperial Defence, Sir Maurice Hankey played a seminal role in the evolution of the Cabinet Secretariat (referred to later as the Cabinet Office) from its origins in 1916 up to the threshold of the Second World War. This well-written and informative study brings into focus Hankey as administrator, advisor, and confidant of five successive Prime Secretariats (referred to later as the "theoretical framework," Professor Naylor explores the impact of Hankey and the Secretariat on the development of modern Cabinet government. The Cabinet Secretariat formed the central agency for the "preparation and disposition" of Cabinet business, assisting in the creation of prime ministerial government. The Secretariat also served as the custodian of Cabinet secrecy. Hankey urged the Cabinet to restrict the availability of official minutes and papers in an effort to maintain a cloak of secrecy around the decision-making process.

Unfortunately for our continued grasp of the mechanisms of Cabinet government, the insights provided by the Hankey diaries and those of his subordinate Tom Jones are not likely to be repeated. With the passing of years, the belief that civil servants should avoid keeping private commentaries and the restrictions imposed under the Official Secrets Act and the opinion of the British Government that confidential Cabinet business should not be discussed by participants for fifteen years or made available to the public for thirty years limits the inquiry into the operations of the Cabinet and the Secretariat. For historians and the general public, the Hankey years remain as the most fertile for understanding modern Cabinet government.

The first six chapters of the monograph deal with the establishment of the Cabinet Secretariat, the early years of uncertainty about the future of the new institution after the collapse of Lloyd George's coalition government, and the development of the Secretariat as the agency for the preparation of the Cabinet agenda and records, forming the chief avenue by which Cabinet decisions were transmitted to governmental departments. While Hankey often sought to influence policy, especially in defense matters, his insistence on a nonpartisan office, administrative efficiency and loyalty to the incumbent Prime Minister resulted in the acceptance of the Secretariat as a useful and necessary part of government. As Naylor points out, after years in charge of the Cabinet Secretariat, Hankey became an institution in his own right.

In the introduction and closing chapter, Naylor considers the neglected area of Cabinet secrecy. Hankey's influence in the development of Cabinet secrecy is traced throughout the book. In the aftermath of the First World War, political figures rushed to publish memoirs that defended their conduct as wartime ministers. This threatened to breach Cabinet secrecy, posing great problems for the custodians of the institution's records. The common view was that Cabinet Papers remained the personal property of ministers after their departure from office. But with the conviction of Edgar Lansbury in 1934 under the Official Secrets Act, Hankey moved the Cabinet in the direction of retention of all documents.

Hankey was responsible for reviewing before publication memoirs and official histories to locate violations of Cabinet secrecy. It is ironic that Hankey, intent upon publishing his own recollections of the First World War, was delayed until 1961 by the restrictions that he had worked so hard to develop during his tenure as Cabinet Secretary.

In the preparation of this study Naylor made use of a wide selection of primary sources, ranging from Hankey's diaries to the Cabinet Papers. He provides insights into the history of the Cabinet Secretariat, the crucial role of Hankey in that development, and the issue of Cabinet secrecy. Readers interested in the evolution of Cabinet government in the twentieth

century, students of inter-war British history, and those concerned with the wider questions posed by the issue of government secrecy in a democratic society will be rewarded by reading this solid work by a first-rate historian.

Van M. Leslie
University of Kentucky

The Formation of Craft Labor Markets. By ROBERT M. JOHNSON. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc., 1984. Pp. xiii + 353. Bibliography, index. \$45.00.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the labor market for both the printing and construction industries was filled by the master craftsman, his apprentices, and a journeyman or two. The scale of operations was small, as was the demand for labor; consequently there was no necessity for an elaborate mechanism to fill the labor needs of employers. By 1920 both industries had been transformed by capitalist development. Increased demand, larger firms, and a sizeably increased labor force made the old forms obsolete. How a rationalized craft labor market emerged in printing and carpentry—characterized by stable organizations of both workers and employers—is the question posed by sociologist Robert Max Johnson.

Though room is made for ideology as an autonomous causal factor, Jackson's theoretical model rests heavily on the economic structure of the industries, and the formation of organizational interests. Only when the relations of production became sufficiently unambiguous—among other things, when most journeymen realized that they could not realistically hope to become masters themselves—did they organize successfully. While employers in printing and construction were able to break down the labor process through the use of new forms of organization and technological innovation, printers and carpenters retained a strategic position within the industries due to the continuing salience of their skill. However, they carried with them a faith in politics and bourgeois liberalism that often lessened their resolve to struggle at the workplace. Only the failure of several attempts at organization, coupled with the loss of jobs apparently due to technological change—the business cycle was the true villain—made workers realize the necessity of strong centralized unions that controlled access to jobs. This concern with jobs was institutionalized in carpentry by the rise of the union business agent, who was required by the temporary nature of the construction work site (an effective strike had to be called before completion of the building) to be the sole person able to call strikes in response to the violation of union work rules. His monopoly