CrossMark

Another welcome feature of this study is that its analysis is primarily centered on the majority of the British population. The working-class experience dominates the first two-thirds of the book, while middle-class examples are primarily covered in the final chapters. This avoids an issue in many studies that begin with the better-known or more accessible perspective of the middle classes, implicitly naturalizing those experiences and treating the majority as counterpoint.

The benefits of grounding the analysis in individual reactions and social historical evidence seem all the more apparent when they are absent, such as in Gillian Swanson's chapter, which focuses on psychologist William McDougall. McDougall's work posited a conception of human subjectivity not based solely on egotistic motives, as Freud would have it (179), but instead on "a model of the dynamics of association that foregrounded an inherent capacity for attending to the interests of others" (166). This is a topic relevant to the concerns of this volume, and near the end of the chapter the author asserts that "McDougall's model of 'sentiment development' was taken up in applied contexts, from intelligence testing, criminology and psychiatric social work, to sex education and marriage reform" (178). But we are more told of this influence than shown it, and the reader is left uncertain over how those ideas were received by individuals who may have encountered them in the form of state policies.

The final essay in the collection, Hera Cook's, begins by reminding the reader of the volume's recurring theme, that "romantic love" is best understood as a "culturally constructed 'myth,' rather than a biochemical embodied event" (225), before discussing the ways in which individual middle-class women experienced and understood the origins of second-wave feminism, as recorded in the pages of the feminist periodical *Nova* between 1965 and 1970. Cook's close readings of individual narratives supports her observation that "there were no culturally acceptable means of expressing these feelings [of anger and distress] in 1960s England," and it was "a willingness to be hostile to men" that became "the basic and much needed innovation of the women's liberation movement, along with sisterhood" (233, 239). These observations seem to encapsulate a change that separates the era under discussion in the book from later periods. In this way Cook's chapter serves as much as a conclusion for this excellent volume as the brief afterword that follows, in that it suggests the common insights that link to other chapters without explicitly drawing those conclusions.

Charles Upchurch, Florida State University

MIKE HUGGINS. Vice and the Victorians. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Pp. 272. \$112.00 (cloth). doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.90

Popular conceptions of Victorian morality often conjure a world of stark contrasts wherein a tightly buttoned culture of bourgeois domesticity stands vigilant against the temptations and horrors of the city's dreadful delights. Mike Huggins's *Vice and the Victorians*, written for undergraduate students and a broader public, reminds us that vice and virtue were contested categories with mutable meanings contingent upon gender, class, and location. As the book's title suggests, his account focuses on vice, defined as "those behaviours, actions, and habits that by general consensus amongst the respectable were considered immoral, degrading, or depraved" (viii). However, his study helpfully complicates the definition of "respectable," while his case studies show that despite the ubiquitous condemnation of vice in popular and political discourse, the identification, regulation, and mitigation of "vice" was tenuous and moreover that the rhetorical reach of moral reformers largely exceeded their political influence.

848 Book Reviews

Two opening chapters introduce a longer history of vice regulation within Britain and provide an accounting of the myriad locales—urban slums, music halls and theaters, pleasure grounds, fairs, and horse races—in which Victorian reformers saw vice. Such spaces populated an expansive "landscape" of potential perils and formed legible manifestations of vice subject to reform according to the metrics of respectable society. The difficulty reformers faced was that music halls, racecourses, and pubs were neither universally virtuous nor vicious. An urban park could simultaneously offer a place for respectable sociability and covert opportunities for betting, courting, or illicit sexual encounter. Imbricated and spatially coterminous, rough, respectable, and aristocratic leisure cultures frustrated reform efforts.

Huggins's case studies—addressing an "unholy trio" of alcohol, gambling, and sex—demonstrate how Britons perceived and practiced vice. These activities were pervasive though the middle and upper classes were largely able to avoid censure for their transgressions. Huggins argues that lukewarm regulatory efforts and lax enforcement reveal a laissez-faire attitude toward restricting activities like gambling, considered a leisure activity enjoyed by a wide range of the British people. Further undermining anti-vice arguments was the potential profitability to be derived from selling alcohol, taking bets, or publishing the latest odds. Opponents of vice found themselves thwarted by countervailing forces that saw a drink at the pub or a flutter at the track as a leisurely pursuit or entrepreneurial opportunity and not a signifier of systemic depravity.

Two final chapters focus on moral reform and the culture of respectability. Like the variability of vice, reform movements drew their support from a broad social spectrum, and these chapters are attuned to the significant presence of Nonconformist and, to a lesser degree, Anglican voices. Though never truly popular, a wide mix of backgrounds and origins allowed anti-vice advocates to operate on a range of discursive and experiential registers. The fruits of reformers' efforts, however, were uneven, with efforts at curtailing drinking becoming the most successful. Disagreement about the ways and means of mitigating vice, and the association of reform politics with the Liberal party, complicated efforts at systemic reform. Huggins concludes by noting that anti-vice lobbyists were a well-organized if self-referential group and that their message was dulled by the flexibility and permeability with which many of their contemporaries regarded both vice and respectability.

Following an attention to the diversity of spaces in which vice was thought to reside, one of the Huggins' strengths in this book is the incorporation of material from beyond the metropolis. Ireland and the empire, however, only appear fleetingly in this volume, as does any consideration of the role of race in constructing a discourse of vice. While vivid details from newspapers, novels, and parliamentary committees add texture and richness to his account, they occasionally obscure a larger explanation of how attitudes regarding vice and virtue changed over time. As examples within a chapter jump between the eight decades of Victoria's reign, it can be hard to determine what Huggins sees as the mechanisms driving this change. The importance of rising working-class income and leisure time, increasing secularism, and the close connection between the Liberal party and moral reform are all mentioned, but at moments a larger arc of how Victorian society interpreted vice gets lost amidst the detail.

Perhaps the plurality of explanations is exactly the point, however, since Huggins's central contribution is bringing together a range of historiographical interpretations and sources, revealing the world of vice and virtue to be more muddled and contested than the book's intended audience might realize. Indeed, contemporary stereotypes of the Victorians are partly due to the rhetorical success with which reformers made their case. *Vice and the Victorians* encourages a heightened attention not only to the methods and limitations of moral reform campaigns, but also to spatial components of respectability and morality.

Matthew Woodbury, University of Michigan