John Greenaway, *Drink and British Politics: A Study in Policy Making.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2003.

As one would expect from an issue so firmly enmeshed in the culture of English society, drink and the terms in which it was debated have varied from one generation to another. Between 1830 and 1970 in particular, drink attracted considerable excitement and interest in a variety of quarters, beginning with the Victorian temperance movement to drink-driving campaigns more recently. This book is a worthy attempt to disentangle these issues and the way in which they unfolded in the political arenas of Westminster and Whitehall during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

   The majority of the book offers a summary of the ways in which drink was redefined again and again to reflect the concerns of English society over a century and a half. The first half begins with the 1830s, when drink was debated in terms of restrictive practices and political economy. Soon after, during a period that has attracted considerable attention from historians and witnessed the proliferation of many alternative recreational practices, drink emerged as the moralist issue of temperance and individual purity, intemperance being regarded by some as the "Achilles heel of Victorian society" (9). Not surprisingly, over the second half of the Victorian period, it was continuously debated in terms of a social evil, with Parliament (and its select committees) remaining the only really significant forum for the discussion and consideration of the licensing question. By the 1880s, the subject polarised political parties like never before, drink being analysed in terms of social reform at both the local level and collectivist state action. At the turn of the century, when Darwinist ideas were to the fore, the subject slots into the debates on supposed national and racial degeneration, resulting, for example, in the influential Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904). Subsequent licensing acts, while being portrayed as precursors of socialism, also reveal that both civil servants and representatives of interested pressure groups were

beginning to play more important parts in related policy-making decisions.

By the First World War, concerns noticeably changed. Drink essentially became an issue of efficiency and national security, its production subject to greater government intervention, including the reduction of sales and licenses in strategic munitions production zones, such as Carlisle. After the cessation of hostilities in Europe, the dominant discourse revolved around the nature of drinking as a leisure activity and the means to achieve the "improved pub." No longer occupying a dominant position in the struggle between the parties, drink rapidly faded from party programmes and manifestos, Whitehall departments (in association with pressure groups and producers) having become the key actors in policy-making. So, too, did the influence of temperance societies decline. In marked contrast to a previous period, besides such matters as compensation for bombed public houses, alcohol was paid comparatively little attention in the Second World War.

From 1950, however, the issue re-emerged and the terms of reference had changed again; unlike in the Great War, the focus was now on drink as a health issue. Additionally, besides comprising much interesting new research, the section covering the post-war years concentrates on three case studies: liquor licensing in the New Towns, government policy towards alcoholism, and drink/driving. Interestingly, by the 1990s, debates appear to have come full circle with mergers in the industry fuelling discussions of monopoly and the free market once again.

Although the first half of this book essentially summarises key writers in the field of the history of drink, inlcuding Harrison, Thom, Gourvish and Wilson, among many others, the importance of this work is the way in which Greenaway distils these findings and discusses the implications of these historical studies on the history of policy-making more generally. Beyond simply identifying the manner in which drink has been entangled with an amazing array of other legislative and policy concerns, Greenaway

demonstrates that the subject did not simply reflect mainstream political ideologies. For example, while large sections of the population were openly opposed to drink, individuals continued to disagree over the means of reforming society, some preaching the improvement of homes as a solution, while others looked to total abstinence. Drink in its many political guises clearly generated its own ideological schools. As this might suggest, from the earliest days, legislative initiatives or commissions of inquiry into the subject of drink arose as a result of individual experts or enthusiasts. While parties appear to taken collective action in later years, the actions of individuals continued to dominate drink debates and, not surprisingly, opinions were influenced by very specific political agendas. For example, Joseph Chamberlain's interest in licensing is said to have resulted primarily from his well-documented concern for local self-government. High politics from then until now is mined by Greenaway for similar examples of complicated political manoeuvring, demonstrating that policy, though often steered by authority, is equally a means of achieving authority.

   While a final short section assessing the implications of the work on that of scholars in policy studies may be the least familiar aspect of this story to historians, the shift away from broad political histories to what might best be described as a social history of politics (as represented by Greenaway's overall approach to the drink issue) is far more familiar territory. To his credit, Greenaway's book, unlike many of the theoretical models he discusses in his concluding chapter, does not try to simplify the complex world of policy-making as it relates to drink. Instead, he presents a history of drink rooted in time and place, allowing the reader easily to distinguish between the roles of the numerous actors involved in the political process, including politicians, bureaucrats, professional advisors and the public.

<div align="right">Jonathan Reinarz, University of Birmingham</div>