Crime Control & Everyday Life in the Victorian City: The Police and the Public by David Churchill, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017, 320 pp.

Nineteenth-century British criminal justice histories have tended to focus upon the central state. In particular, criminal justice developments and experiences have been discussed, almost exclusively, within the context of a burgeoning bureaucratic state, the growth of the capitalist classes and it's monopolisation of political and social power. Whilst the British state certainly grew in both power and influence during the nineteenth-century, this focus has tended to miss the dynamic role played by individuals, groups, communities and local economic and political concerns in shaping and mediating both the experience and operation of criminal justice in Britain. David Churchill's *Crime Control (2018)* seeks to explore these issues in relation to policing in Victorian England. As Churchill rightly points out, the dominance of the *state monopolisation thesis* has resulted in a false separation of state and civil governance that fails to recognise the dispersal and contingency of power relations, and the diversity of actors and actions involved.

Using an impressive variety of official and non-official sources, Churchill builds an intimate and detailed picture of the successes and mainly failures of preventative policing in Leeds, Manchester and Liverpool, at various points during the period to demonstrate how local mediation of national policing policy ensured that policy in the provinces remained a largely local affair. The chapters (three and four) examining the failure of preventative policing, the disciplinary effect of the new police on urban behaviour and space, and the adaptions of the public to police surveillance are noteworthy in this regard. Here Churchill ably demonstrates how policing was not simply the outcome of macro-power relations, rigid moral regulation, changing structural relationships or an ever-solidifying consensus. Policing at street level was one of fluid relationships, adaptations and negotiation of space. This marked how the police policed, and how the public responded to the police. In this sense, the book stands outside academic convention in policing history, which tends to be constructed upon ideas of more controlling, or more efficient and improving police, to simply ask, what specifically changed at street level?

Churchill's discussion of ratepayers as moral entrepreneurs is also important. Ratepayer, and particularly less wealthy ratepayers, who frequently lived and worked in the same areas as labourers and the underemployed had their own demands and expectation of the new urban environment. They were a vociferous group, who pushed local policing policy in the direction of their demands. Hence, Churchill argues, the grand ideas of preventative policing were lost amidst competing local demands.

Yet, this is not simply a local or provincial study. Churchill's findings relating to Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester challenge generalised orthodoxies in police history, which still lean towards studies of London and the surrounding counties. The focus upon micro-power relations within these cities demonstrates a variety of policing cultures, policies and social experiences that suggests a greater complexity on a national level, not yet fully explored. The distinctions Churchill makes regarding policing in the three cities in terms of time, resources, specific populations and policing requirements also speaks to these complexities. Conversely, Phillips' study of Middleborough or Storch and Philips' *Provincial Policing*, for example, examine policing culture in provincial England, but do not provide sufficient depth or breadth to make this challenge. This is the strength and essence of Churchill's contribution to English police historiography.

What emerges from *Crime Control* is a picture of policing very familiar to a contemporary audience. Formal policing is clearly, and has largely been, driven by resources. Formal policing is, and has largely been, concerned with public space. However, as Churchill also notes, decisions regarding the deployment of formal policing resources were not objective, but emerged from the successful construction of specific populations, geographical areas and activities, as more threatening or criminal. These perceptions were formed and reformed through a complex multiplicity of micro-macro social and power relations and negotiations that excluded the voice of the most policed. This said, Churchill is clear that *crime control* did not control crime, but the disciplinary effect of formal surveillance on behaviour and perceptions of social and cultural acceptability did alter the urban experience. This is the legacy of Victorian crime control. For Criminologists and sociologists, as well as crime and social historians, these are fundamental considerations, and ones that make this book both a timely and welcome addition to research in this area.

David Orr is a senior lecturer in Criminology at the Lancashire Law School, University of Central Lancashire. Author of, *'The Foul Conspiracy to Screen Salisbury and Sacrifice Morton': A Micro-history of Extortion, Resistance and Same Sex Intimacy in Early Nineteenth-century London*, he is currently working on *Prison and Workhouse Reform in 19th-Century England: Shaping Incarceration,* for Bloomsbury Academic Press.