

example). At its heart, however, this is an exposure of how deeply the English legal system of the period relied on judgments about reputation and respectability. Swan was able to evade suspicion largely because she was composed, articulate, and seemed to conform to the expectations of feminine propriety. Gooding, by contrast, had an illegitimate child, lived under the same roof as a sister who had illegitimate children, and had been heard having heated arguments with her husband. It was far easier for judges and juries to believe that she had penned the obscenities than the apparently upstanding Miss Swan. This was compounded by the perfunctory nature of the investigation that underpinned the first two trials; some fairly obvious gaps in the initial case were not pursued, and a request from one jury to compare handwriting samples was not permitted by the judge. In the absence of verifiable evidence, much relied on assessments of the personalities involved, using the cues and codes of self-presentation, language, and reputation. Even when, in the fourth trial, it was possible to marshal an array of evidence that pointed to Swan's guilt, the presiding judge, Justice Horace Ivory, did little to disguise his doubts in his summing-up: "Accused's demeanour in the witness box was that of a respectable, clean-mouthed woman," Ivory noted, "and the jury would have to consider whether it was conceivable that she could have written this document" (159).

Hilliard offers this short work as an "extended response" (175) to Matt Houlbrook's challenge for historians of popular culture to explore the imaginative lives not just of the minority of working-class autodidacts and radicals who produced memoirs, but of the far more typical readers who consumed romances and crime fiction. The book shares the open and humane reading of working-class life that marks the author's earlier study of the democratization of writing in the period, and he investigates the way the individuals caught up in this case expressed their agency through different forms of speech and handwriting. Hilliard offers a plausible psychological reading of Swan, but does not insist upon it; he is alive to the limits of what the historian can know. Put down that Golden Age detective fiction awhile, and sample the many pleasures of *The Littlehampton Libels*.

ADRIAN BINGHAM  
*University of Sheffield*

TARAK BARKAWI. *Soldiers of Empire: Indian and British Armies in World War II*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xvii, 321. \$24.99.

With *Soldiers of Empire*, Tarak Barkawi adds a new and important dimension to our understanding of the Indian Army's effectiveness and role in the Second World War. There has been a revival of interest in the role, battlefield performance, and understanding of the Indian Army since the New Military History of South Asia conference at Wolfson College, Cambridge, in 1997; that event identified the need for a new historiography on the study of the army from its inception to its final days in 1947. This renewed focus has informed works focusing on both the Indian Army's battlefield performance and its impact on

society; in particular, works by Alan Jeffreys, Yasmin Khan, Tim Moreman, and Kaushik Roy come to mind as notable examples of this new movement. Barkawi's book provides another facet to this historiography: he takes an innovative approach by assessing the sociological aspects of the Indian Army during the Second World War. This work has been in the making for many years, and is stronger as a result, drawing as it does on the best recent scholarship and reflecting the author's mature approach to the topic.

The book is well organized into three principal sections: "Colonial Soldiers," "Going to War," and "History and Theory." Within each of these overarching sections, the book is further subdivided into chapters focusing on significant aspects of the larger topic. The chapters in part I—"Making Colonial Soldiers in British India," "Unmaking an Imperial Army," and "Politics and Prisoners in the Indian Army"—together provide a sound foundation presenting some of the core sociological themes of the prewar and Second World War eras. Barkawi highlights key findings from previous works and authors, and adds some new and important analysis to these well-trodden debates.

The strongest part of the book is part II, "Going to War." The chapters in this section—"Defeat, Drill, and Discipline," "Ritual, Solidarity, and Sacrifice," and "Battle"—are superb. They are the best-researched and best-analyzed sections of the book, and add new and important analysis to the key debates surrounding the Indian Army in the Second World War. The interviews with veterans in particular highlight the important but different approaches that historians have taken in research. I previously had the pleasure and honor of interviewing some of the key individuals featured here, including George Coppen and John Randle. Barkawi has asked different questions, and I was interested to read the new information and perspectives that his focus provides. It is also heartening to see the retired Indian Army community supporting Barkawi's research, as they have supported Moreman and me since the late 1990s. Their firsthand perspective is increasingly valuable as it slowly disappears with the passage of time.

My only quibble regarding these important chapters is the placement of chapters 4 and 5. I feel that reversing them would have made the flow of content and analysis even stronger.

Part III, "History and Theory," and its component chapters—"The Experience and Representation of Combat" and "Cosmopolitan Military Histories and Sociologies"—are also well researched and written, but again I must question the placement of this part of the book. Overall, this is a minor criticism, but I do feel that the organization of the book could have been more carefully thought through. Part III deals with some fundamental foundational issues and themes, and I feel it would have made the book even stronger if placed at the beginning. I would have made this section part I, followed by the current parts I and II. I feel this would have improved the flow of the core themes and debates for readers.

While Barkawi's book is a standalone work, readers and historians new to the topic of the Indian Army and the Burma Campaign would benefit from reading it alongside

other key texts—many of which Barkawi highlights. Reading in this context helps to pinpoint the key role that this new book plays in the historiography of the Indian Army and the Burma Campaign in the Second World War.

*Soldiers of Empire* is a significant work. It adds a new and valuable dimension to our understanding of the Indian Army and its battlefield performance in the Second World War, chiefly in the Burma Campaign. This book, as with other works in the new historiography of the Indian Army, will add an important perspective and understanding of this important institution. It should be required reading for war and society and South Asian historians.

DANIEL PATRICK MARSTON  
Australian National University

DANIEL BRÜCKENHAUS. *Policing Transnational Protest: Liberal Imperialism and the Surveillance of Anticolonialists in Europe, 1905–1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. xi, 300. \$74.00.

In *Policing Transnational Protest*, Daniel Brückenhaus tracks how Britain and France constructed transnational policing practices and institutions in the first half of the twentieth century in order to monitor and combat anti-imperial movements that were, themselves, increasingly international. Indian and Indochinese activists had discovered even before World War I that anticolonial organizing might be less harshly repressed in the imperial metropole than in the colonies from which they came—and, further, that if those imperial metropolises became too hot, they might take refuge in another European state. Brückenhaus tells his story chronologically, showing how the imperial powers first sent agents abroad to monitor those mobile colonial subjects, how they established more lasting and collaborative surveillance systems during and after World War I, and how the Versailles settlement—and especially German hostility to that settlement—created new opportunities for anticolonialists and new challenges for imperial authorities during the 1920s and 1930s.

Two key arguments emerge. First, in a manner reminiscent of work showing the mutually constitutive character of imperialism and nationalism, Brückenhaus insists on the deeply symbiotic character of global anticolonialism and international policing. Anticolonialists crossed borders and set up organizations in Brussels or Berlin in order to evade surveillance and publish or proselytize more freely, but by doing so they drove imperial authorities toward transnational collaboration as well. The conflict between anticolonialists and police authorities is thus best seen, Brückenhaus concludes, as “a feedback cycle in which both sides caused each other to become more transnational in the scope of their networks and in their ideologies” (4). In a series of compelling vignettes, we see that dynamic at work: the Indian nationalist Vinayak Damodar Savarkar’s move to Paris to print anti-British literature before 1914 spurs British officials to follow him; the Lebanese Chekib Arslan’s cultivation of German support for his protests against French rule in Syria elicits powerful French efforts in Geneva aimed at discrediting him. The

Berlin-based League Against Imperialism, to which Brückenhaus devotes a chapter, is perhaps the most impressive expression of that transnational anticolonialism, but the group’s close ties to the Comintern similarly produced a more uniformly hostile governmental response, with not only French and British imperial authorities, but by the early 1930s the usually more lenient Weimar authorities as well, going to some trouble to harass and repress it.

Germany figures importantly in many of these stories; indeed, establishing the centrality of post-Versailles German revisionism not just to the European crisis of the interwar years but equally to that period’s unstable imperial politics is the book’s second main contribution. Other scholars in recent years, notably Kris Manjappa, Jonathan Derrick, and Susan Dabney Pennybacker, have investigated Germany’s surprising role in fostering interwar colonial activism; Brückenhaus has, however, gone further than any previous scholar to provide a deeply researched and nuanced account of the complex relations between German officials and anticolonial activists over three decades. Those German efforts predated World War I, but during the war a special branch of the German Foreign Office, the Nachrichtenstelle für den Orient, was established and worked assiduously to foment colonial rebellion. The failure to restore Germany’s colonial territories in 1919 was deplored across the political spectrum, and while some Anglophile and centrist Foreign Ministry officials like State Secretary Carl von Schubert sought to rebuild relations with Britain and even to lend behind-the-scenes support to British surveillance efforts, others in Germany found good reasons—anticolonialism on the communist left, anti-Versailles revisionism on the right—to back anticolonial networks. Such support was often patronizing and self-interested: Brückenhaus shows, for example, how German officials in the early 1920s tried to exploit Cameroonian Wilhelm Munumé’s anti-French sentiments to their own ends, and Nazi support for Haj Amin al-Husseini and Subhas Chandra Bose was transparently driven by geopolitical aims. Colonial activists, however, also played their cards adroitly, pitting the Germans and French against one another, or abandoning Berlin altogether when it became too “hot.”

If Brückenhaus persuasively shows how anticolonial activism and German support contributed to the emergence of transnational policing, to his credit he never overstates this case. Even when they collaborated behind the scenes, all states, he points out, loudly insisted on their sovereign independence, resisted extraditing activists at another government’s request, and sometimes even defended anti-imperial activists when host countries or peoples turned violent (as the British did when Indians were set upon by Nazi mobs). For all their supposed imperial solidarity, too, he shows that the British and French alliance was often strained, with the French much more likely to see all anticolonial activism as a product of German manipulation, and the British much more willing to contemplate German collaboration. Carefully argued, and based on prodigious research in British, French, German, and Indian archives, this important but restrained book is a