

exchanges of views and conferences convened by the socialists in the years up to 1960, nothing is revealed to trouble authors such as Geoff Eley and Donald Sassoon whose histories of socialism relegate the Socialist International to the margins of their discussions, when it is mentioned at all. The main function of the Socialist International in the 1950s was to promote Atlanticism, not socialist internationalism, and that was being done in other venues with more impact on policy.

JOHN CALLAGHAN

University of Salford

1916 in Global Context: An Anti-Imperial Moment. Edited by *Enrico Dal Lago, Róisín Healy, and Gearóid Barry*. Routledge Studies in Modern European History. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018. Pp. xvi+232. \$144.95 (cloth); \$54.95 (e-book).

Revolutions and Counter-Revolution: 1917 and Its Aftermath from a Global Perspective. Edited by *Stefan Rinke and Michael Wildt*. *Eigene und Fremde Welten*. Edited by *Jörg Baberowski, Stefan Rinke, and Michael Wildt*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2017. Pp. 344. \$50.00.

1917: War, Peace, and Revolution. By *David Stevenson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. xxxviii+480. \$39.95.

Historians who study World War I have for the past several years been engulfed in a whirlwind of centenaries. One might object, with some justification, that a centennial is an arbitrary exercise. Why should an event attract our attention just because it took place a certain round number of years ago? But if history is what we remember then the rolling centennials of the past several years have offered an opportunity to recall the history of the Great War, to reassess it in light of new historical approaches, and to explore new perspectives.

Two characteristics have marked much of the recent scholarly production on the history of the war, including of the three works under review here. The first is an “imperial turn” in the history of the war, often coupled with the related adoption of a more fully global perspective on the conflict. The second is a reinvigorated focus on the theme of revolution and its deep entanglement with the history of World War I.

Moreover, the march of centenaries that began in 2014 has encouraged historians to turn their attention beyond the “origins” and “legacies” moments of 1914 and 1918–19, where much of the interpretive weight of earlier work had laid.¹ This has led to a focus on the in-between years, from 1915 to 1917, and so to a consideration of the events that occurred between outbreak and armistice within their own world-historical context rather than simply as way stations on the road from outbreak to armistice.² This is what the three volumes under review here all try to do, each in its own way. Below I will first consider each volume

¹ These literatures are vast, but classic works on the “origins” side include Barbara Tuchman, *Guns of August* (1962), and James Joll, *The Origins of the First World War* (2002), while prominent recent additions are Christopher Clark, *Sleepwalkers* (2014), and Sean McMeekin, *July 1914* (2013). On the “legacies” side, prominent examples include Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919* (2003), and David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace* (1989).

² It has also encouraged scholars to push the history of the war beyond the traditional 1914–19 timeframe, as in Robert Gerwarth and Erez Manela, eds., *Empires at War, 1911–1923* (2014).

individually and then assess what, taken together, they might tell us about the state of World War I historiography and the road ahead.

The first in the trio is *1916 in Global Context: An Anti-Imperial Moment*, which emerged from a 2016 (centennial) conference held at the National University of Ireland Galway. Edited by three scholars based there, the volume seeks to provide a global and comparative perspective on the 1916 Easter Rising in Ireland against British rule. One wonders why this focus is not stated explicitly in the book's title, as it would not necessarily be obvious to potential readers not steeped in Irish history. A possible explanation for that omission is that the editors wanted to highlight the argument that the Irish uprising stood at the center of, and served as an inspiration for, "a global anti-imperial moment" in 1916, a moment that was, they further argue, the "revolutionary counterpart to the later diplomatic attempt to construct a new world order in the so-called Wilsonian moment" (3). In order to make that case, the volume looks "both at transnational connections and parallels between the Irish Easter Rising and contemporaneous events throughout the globe as part of a synchronous anti-imperial moment" (8). They are interested, then, in both connection *and* synchronicity. The two phenomena, however, clearly shade into each other, as even contemporaneous upheavals in 1916 that cannot be directly connected to the Easter Rising through an archival paper trail were presumably shaped by some of the same world-historical factors that drove events in Ireland. In history, as John Lewis Gaddis once wrote, there are no independent variables.³

After an introductory section that nicely sketches the basic historical and historiographical landscape of the Easter Rising, the volume proceeds geographically, with successive parts covering the Atlantic world, from Quebec to South Africa; North Africa, Asia, and the Pacific, from the Middle East and Central Asia through India to Australia; and Europe, from Britain to Finland via Poznan and the Trentino. As promised, some of the chapters center on connections, including unexpected ones, such as the echoes of the events in Ireland in Russian Central Asia. Other chapters lean more into simultaneity and a few are simply comparative, such as the one that pairs the Easter Rising in 1916 with the Poznan Uprising of 1918–19, putting them both within the context of the world historical forces that fractured the imperial world order in those years. This chapter and others destabilize the sharp distinction that the editors attempt to make in the introduction between the "revolutionary" nature of 1916 versus the "diplomatic" character of the Wilsonian moment. Both moments saw their share of diplomacy and revolution, and it is probably better to think, world historically, of a "long decade" of revolution that began in 1910/11 with the upheavals in Mexico and China and did not abate until the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne in July 1923.⁴

Still, this volume repays careful reading for the surprising connections, reverberations, and juxtapositions that it unearths, and it does an important service in establishing the significance of the Easter Rising within the revolutionary, anti-imperial arc of that decade. But if the significance of the 1916 Easter Rising outside of its local context still required elaboration, few historians would be surprised to learn that the events of the following year, which saw both the Bolshevik Revolution and the US entry into the war, had world-historical significance. Nevertheless, the two remaining volumes under review here, in very different ways, boldly set out to reconsider that much-debated historical moment.

The two editors of *Revolutions and Counter-Revolutions: 1917 and Its Aftermath from a Global Perspective*, based in Berlin, include one (Wildt) who is an expert in modern German history and another (Rinke) who is a specialist in Latin America and the author,

³ John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (2002).

⁴ This follows a central argument in Gerwarth and Manela, *Empires at War*.

among other books, of the pioneering *Latin America and the First World War* (2017). Unlike the volume on *1916 in Global Context*, which had set out for itself the mission of globalizing the history of the Easter Rising, this one is more loosely constructed. The Russian Revolution is a recurring theme in much of the volume and several contributions focus on its origins, impacts, or legacies, but others relate to it only indirectly. Rinke's field of expertise is reflected in the unusually (in the context of World War I scholarship) robust attention paid to the Iberian world, with two chapters on Latin America and another two on Spain. But other chapters range widely both geographically and thematically, with forays into Turkey, China, and Japan, as well as North America. Regrettably, the volume lacks an index, reducing its usefulness as a scholarly resource.

In a wide-ranging volume such as this, the chapters of greatest interest to any reader will reflect that reader's background and interests. For this reviewer, they included the chapter by Abdulhamit Kırmızı, which traces the close connections, in both material support and ideological affinity, between the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's "Anatolian Revolution" and then reflects on how those connections might complicate our views on the connections between nationalism and socialism in that era. Another fascinating chapter, by Izao Tomio, recounting a story rarely found in English-language accounts of World War I, covers Japan's years-long intervention in Siberia, which began in 1918. The Japanese military, Izao tells us, at first viewed the Bolsheviks as German puppets and expected to encounter an undisciplined rabble that would easily be routed. Instead, the Siberian intervention became the Japanese Empire's "first lost war" (165), with important repercussions for the future of Japan's empire-building efforts in the region.

While *Revolutions and Counter-Revolutions* offers a wide-ranging series of reflections on the impact of the upheavals of 1917 in a diverse set of places and milieus, a more coherent narrative of that year and its world-historical significance is the purpose of David Stevenson's *1917: War, Peace, and Revolution*. Stevenson, a professor at the London School of Economics, has devoted a distinguished career to writing on the origins and history of World War I, with his numerous books on the topic including two previous ones that centered on a single year of that history, one on 1914 and the other on 1918.⁵ Unlike the two other volumes reviewed here, this one is single-authored and was clearly written, produced, and priced to reach an educated "general public" as much as a scholarly audience, a goal that the book's publication on the centennial of 1917 was perhaps intended to facilitate. It is also, again unlike the previous two volumes under review, primarily a narrative account.

The brief introduction quickly catches readers up on the events leading up to the end of 1916, but it does so without making a case for why a history of the war focused on the year 1917 is needed or explaining what well-informed readers should expect to find here that is new. The chapters that follow present a well-written account of the military, political, and diplomatic history of the war in that year, but unlike some of the other recent "big books" on the history of the war, like those by Clark and McMeekin cited above, this book lacks substantial historiographical engagement and does not seem to present a novel interpretive stance. A nod to new trends in World War I historiography does come in a section titled "Global Repercussions," where Stevenson briefly covers the 1917 entry into the war of Brazil, Siam, and China; offers a chapter on wartime political development in India; and, in the section's longest chapter, discusses the Balfour Declaration and wartime developments in Palestine. Here too, however, the narrative hews to well-worn paths, and it remains unclear what the temporal framing around 1917 adds to the story.

⁵ David Stevenson, *The Outbreak of the First World War: 1914 in Perspective* (1997), Stevenson, *With Our Backs to the Wall: Victory and Defeat in 1918* (2011).

In fact, reading *1917* might prompt readers to reflect on the risks of imposing an arbitrary timeframe on a historical narrative without providing a compelling justification for doing so. That year was surely an important turning point in the history of the war and, indeed, of the twentieth century writ large, not least for the world-historical consequences of the Russian Revolution and the US entry into the war. But the causes and consequences of those events (as well as others, such as the Balfour Declaration) stretched well beyond the boundaries of that year, and the temporal straitjacket adopted in this volume tends to make those momentous events seem smaller and less consequential than they really were.

So, what do the three volumes under review here tell us about the state of World War I historiography and its future possibilities? First, and most clearly, they tell us that the history of the conflict, following the general trend in the profession, has gone global. The first two volumes set this move as an explicit aim, and even the third one, though the most traditional by far, nods toward the global perspective. Students and scholars looking for new discoveries, angles, and arguments on the much-written history of the war must therefore cast their net widely, globally; not because events in Europe were less important than those in other places but because they have taken up, still, the lion's share of the words written on that history.

Second, and related, is the imperial turn in the history of the Great War, meaning a recognition that the conflict was, in important yet understudied ways, "a war of empires, fought primarily by empires and for the survival and expansion of empire."⁶ This perspective calls our attention not only to the mass participation of colonial troops and laborers from India, Africa, and elsewhere, but also to the impact of the war on the world well beyond Europe, a theme recognized in one way or another in all the volumes under review here. The imperial turn also calls our attention to the war not simply as an anti-imperial moment, or even as a series of such moments, but as a conflict embedded in a violent, revolutionary "long decade" that began in Mexico in 1910 and did not abate until 1923, and perhaps not even then. If they adopt this perspective, young scholars entering the field of World War I studies need not despair of the shelves groaning under the weight of the many previous books on the topic. There is plenty more to do.

EREZ MANELA

Harvard University

Catholic Modern: The Challenge of Totalitarianism and the Remaking of the Church. By *James Chappel*.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018. Pp. viii+342. \$35.00.

On first glance at the chapter headings of this volume, beginning with "Catholic Anti-modernism, 1920–1929" and concluding with "The Return of Heresy in the Global 1960s," it might seem as if the author were trying to squeeze a centuries-long process into the period since the 1920s. The result, however, is a persuasive account, from the perspective of intellectual history, of how ultramontane Catholicism swiftly but gradually discarded its ingrained antimodern stance.

An issue that Chappel takes up from the outset is "that much-abused word 'modern.'" One helpful distinction he introduces for the twentieth-century Catholic context is between "paternal modernism" and "fraternal modernism," the subjects of chapters 2 and

⁶ Gerwarth and Manela, *Empires at War*, 15.