

that Hutton was correct in asserting that the era following the Restoration represented a watershed in Birmingham's development—the moment when it became “no longer just a town of local and regional significance” but “an urban centre of national importance” (121). Yet this very assertion speaks to a fundamental tension at work in this volume between the editors' stated desire to produce a chronologically inclusive account of the city and the book's actual contents. Only one of the chapters (Chinn's, addressing the history of Birmingham's evolving population) actually spans the entirety of the city's history, three others address the city's history from ancient times to 1700, and the remaining eight address the post-1700 period, thus yielding the impression that while one might be able to trace the history of Birmingham into the depths of the historical record, its historical significance outside its immediate local context really only began during the modern era, making its historical trajectory more like that of Manchester (or Leeds, or Sheffield) than the essayists in this book seem to want to suggest.

Another similarity between the history assembled here and that produced by early historians of Birmingham like Hutton (and for that matter, twentieth-century historians like Asa Briggs) is the authors' collective insistence on Birmingham's exceptionalism. Like Hutton, Chinn emphasizes the entrepreneurial “verve” of the city's inhabitants (301), asserting that, “unlike most great centres of population,” Birmingham's expansion into a city of national and global importance “was not facilitated by providential physical or geographical features,” but instead depended “almost entirely upon the talents of its people and upon the relationships they formed” (10–11). We likewise learn that the city possessed a unique status as a community that welcomed religious dissenters in the early modern era, played a pioneering role in both the development of compulsory elementary education and the teaching of math and science to women and girls, produced an unrivaled range of voluntary hospitals, and represented the most important locus of the printing industry outside of London.

Many of the arguments advanced here in favor of Birmingham's unique development are convincing. In particular, the chapters by Dick, Roger Ward, and Jonathán Reinartz collectively demonstrate how in the nineteenth century, the city's diverse range of small-scale manufacturing industries created a social context that promoted more harmonious relations between employers and workers, which in turn fostered greater cross-class cooperation in local politics. This same economic diversity allowed the city's many medical charities to thrive because it provided them with a varied financial base, protecting them from the market fluctuations that undermined the survival of similar institutions in single-industry towns, like Manchester. Still, at times a bit more emphasis on comparison—more discussion of shared trends rather than just particularities—might have further enriched this beautiful and insightful study of one of Britain's most important global cities.

Christopher Ferguson
 Auburn University
cjf0006@auburn.edu

HAROLD D. CLARKE, MATTHEW GOODWIN, and PAUL WHITELEY. *Brexit: Why Britain Voted to Leave the European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. 256. \$19.99 (paper).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.31

The question evoked by the title of this book, *Brexit: Why Britain Voted to Leave the European Union*, will reverberate in the future. While the United Kingdom's 2016 referendum on membership in the European Union, or Brexit, is frequently regarded as an event, daily the British state and those who follow its fortunes are reminded that Brexit will be a lengthy process,

accompanied by as many twists and turns, dramas and *longueurs*, as any other major event in history. All aspects of the decision to call a nonbinding referendum—the campaign, the vote, and the aftermath—will be the subject of interpretation, reinterpretation, and commentary for many years to come.

In their book, which is partly based on a preexisting research project on the UK Independence Party, or UKIP, and a coalition of their research interests, Harold Clarke, Matthew Goodwin, and Paul Whiteley attempt to answer the most fundamental question: Why did Britain vote the way it did? While offering some contextual and historical analysis, they make their book's main contribution through the analysis of polling data, taken both before and after referendum was announced and then during the campaign. As with any studies of voter attitudes and behavior, caveats about sampling methods and timing are important to note but are also set here within a conceptual scoping of the issues. The questions posed are those that the researchers consider to be important or have received support to investigate. However, some issues are simply not amenable to research being undertaken in this way, such as the longer-term approach of UK governments to effectively hide EU policy and legislation within domestic initiatives. There are also some groups that are critical to any understanding of the United Kingdom's long-term attitudes towards Europe and the influence that they have had on this ministerial practice, such as UK senior civil servants, who have never been polled on their attitudes to the European Union. The role of most of the press, both in its long-term antagonism to the European Union and its support for vote leave in the campaign, is not fully explored. Given these issues, what does this book tell us and does it meet the claim in its title?

Clarke, Goodwin, and Whiteley open the book by setting the political context for the decision to hold the referendum, a summary of the key events and political machinations from launch to vote, illustrated using contemporaneous polling data. They move on to set this information within a valence theory approach to political attitudes, both in general and reflected in individual voter behavior. It is here that the opinion polling research is used to analyze the trends in voters' views about governments, the capability of such polls in dealing with key issues, particularly the economy, and to argue that, in this referendum, long-held and settled views had a considerable influence on voter behavior. The authors' main conclusion here is that longer-term political views prevailed over issues raised in the campaign in influencing voters.

The core of the book is a discussion of the rise of UKIP as a party in the United Kingdom and its influence over the mainstream parties and their attitudes towards the European Union. This section of the book does much to identify the attractions of what has lately been termed “populism” and of anti-immigration and outsider narratives, which in this case are inextricably bound together. The polling data cited here demonstrate clearly the fears of the Conservative Party about UKIP's influence and potential for capturing votes in critical seats, fears that influenced the prime minister's decision to commit to the referendum. There follows an analysis of why people voted as they did. Subsequent chapters consider the economic consequences of Brexit, including those related to immigration, and the last chapter discusses whether the referendum and the polling associated with it mark a trend in the European Union or will be a “one-off.”

In the longer term, chapters in this book are likely to be key reference sources, particularly those on the rise of UKIP and what influenced vote leave in the short run of the referendum campaign. The use of polling data is helpful in this analysis, as is the discussion about the role of political valence. There are, however, some issues that the authors do not fully address, and this is a challenge for all authors writing on Brexit while the process is underway. While Clarke, Goodwin, and Whiteley discuss the long-held attitudes about the EU held by the British public, they do not consider the role of successive UK governments, the civil service, and the anti-EU press and how these might have influenced longer-term attitudes beyond those of supporters of UKIP. Nor do they discuss in any depth is the role of austerity in creating the political cradle for growing outsiderism that both fueled the rise of UKIP and allowed blame for its

consequences, including National Health Service and public service funding reductions, to be attributed to the European Union by the Leave campaign. While the longer-term views of the electorate were clearly important, many of the Leave campaign claims did have a confirming resonance with those already inclined to vote this way and did influence swing voters. Another issue not discussed fully is the failure in the leadership of the Labor party to be actively engaged in a pro-Remain stance, again possibly because of their own fears about the loss of seats to UKIP supporting candidates in local and national elections. Notwithstanding these issues, this is book a major contribution to the literature of the conundrum that is Brexit.

Janice Morphet
University College London
j.morphet@ucl.ac.uk

CATHERINE COX and SUSANNA RIORDAN, eds. *Adolescence in Modern Irish History*. Palgrave Studies in the History of Childhood. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. Pp. 229. \$100.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.32

This edited collection, emerging from a 2011 workshop in University College Dublin, is the first volume to specifically address youth in modern Irish history. As well as seeking to determine how Irish adolescence fits within extant international scholarship, another of the key motivations of editors Catharine Cox and Susanna Riordan was to “decouple” the history of adolescence from the history of childhood (1). While the history of childhood in Ireland has received more attention to date, the liminal state of adolescence, marking a life stage between childhood and the autonomy and responsibility of adulthood, is crucial to understand particularly in the time period considered here, when ideas of adolescence were being fashioned by early psychologists. As this volume clearly demonstrates, adolescence was often constructed as a vulnerable period of “moral malleability” (3)—potentially dangerous, particularly in an increasingly urban and industrial context in which young people were deemed to require careful management. Several chapters problematize conventional definitions of adolescence; for example, Mary Daly highlights the experiences of men in rural Ireland being referred to as “boys” even into their forties because their parents had not passed over ownership of the farm, leaving their sons in a subservient position.

Cox and Riordan have assembled a volume that engages with the question of what might have been distinctive about Irish adolescence (or adolescences)—that is, particular to the religious, social, economic, and political circumstances of Ireland across this period. In doing so, their volume looks outward, seeking comparison largely with Britain and America, to inform understandings of Irish adolescence. The nine chapters in this collection span the late Georgian period to the 1970s, and variously “describe aspects of the experience of, commentary on, and efforts to mould Irish adolescents” (4). The chapters are ordered broadly chronologically, rather than by theme. Few draw on sources produced by adolescents themselves. While Jonathan Jeffrey Wright examines adolescent juvenilia and correspondence, offering a rare window into a particular set of adolescent experiences, and Marnie Hay and Bryce Evans utilize the retrospective testimony of adults considering their experiences in youth, the majority of chapters reveal more about the attitudes and actions of various officials and institutions than of adolescents themselves. While recognizing that there is a bias in extant literature toward examining youth in urban areas, Cox and Riordan note that, due largely to the types of source material available, this collection, too, is oriented more toward the urban than the rural.