

While Farmer's account is focused, inevitably for such a study, it occasionally overstates the importance of food in film: food alone did not "distinguish between the national 'self' and its international 'other'" (224) in Alberto Cavalcanti's 1942 film, *Went the Day Well?*, for example. However, this does not mar a solid contribution to scholarship. Farmer's interpretation is especially strong when confronting the tensions within propaganda about food and its fundamental instability. He deftly shows how frictions inherent in the construction of what came to be understood as the people's war, defined by class, generation, gender, and region, were played out in MoF and feature film propaganda. Depictions of restricted goods provoked particular excitement, notably within films imported from the United States: "Someone *should* tell Hollywood that food is rationed here," advised a 1941 letter from a housewife to fan magazine *Picturegoer* (172–73). Farmer notes the deterioration of public attitudes toward rationing and government intervention in food policy as the defeat of Germany became increasingly likely and its associated effect on publicity campaigns (140). However, such comments require more evidence than Farmer sometimes provides. In order to fully demonstrate that "British consumers were able to maintain contradictory positions on the same subject" (225) and to explore the peaks and troughs in popular opinion on food that in turn were likely to have affected how cinematic appeals and portrayals were received, Farmer's research could have benefitted from a more detailed and deeper reading of Home Intelligence reports, Wartime Social Survey, British Institute of Public Opinion polls, and indeed Mass Observation. The complexity of this issue is amply demonstrated in Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska's study of *Austerity in Britain: Rationing, Controls, and Consumption, 1939–1955* (2000). While Farmer's work considers a rather different set of questions to those posed by Zweiniger-Bargielowska, closer attention would surely have substantiated his central thesis.

Farmer's first chapter contains tantalizing discussions of the context in which film publicity operated, suggesting that a more broadly conceived book would have made for a more satisfying read with the potential to raise questions as to how various MoF and MoI initiatives, such as Food Facts and Kitchen Front, intersected with, reinforced, and potentially undermined one another. Imaginative appeals to eat the National Wheatmeal loaf "because white bread made the table cloth look dirty" and the MoF's invention of the "Effluviator," which "pump[ed] the odour of products baked with National Flour onto a street from a shop on Piccadilly" (38), surely deserve a place within the history of British propaganda at war. A wider scope might also have allowed a discussion of continuity and change within MoF publicity, drawing on Mariel Grant's work on *Propaganda and the State in Inter-war Britain* (1994). *The Food Companions*, nonetheless, with its lively and readable style, opens up an important area for propaganda studies that no doubt this author and others will want to pursue further in the future.

Jo Fox, Durham University

DANIEL GORMAN. *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. 387. \$99.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2013.94

By the late 1930s, the optimism of internationalists who had hoped to build a lasting peace after the Great War had dissipated. For decades, scholars were tempted to dismiss the alternatives they offered as quixotic. Fortunately, it has become commonsensical to recognize, as Daniel Gorman announces at the outset of *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s*, that internationalists, both inside and outside of the League of Nations, might have been idealists, but they helped to "recast global relations, both systemically and culturally, on a more international basis" during this era (3). Building on the seminal scholarship of

Zara Steiner, Susan Pedersen, and Akira Iriye, among others, Gorman thus offers the now less controversial claim that “these bureaucrats and reformers created [a] functional internationalism that outlasted the League and helped to shape the work of the United Nations after 1945” (12). At its finest, this commitment to international society produced reform movements that reshaped imperial and transnational relations along the way (316).

At first glance, one expects *The Emergence of International Society in the 1920s* to offer a synthetic account of new modes of collaboration from the 1920s through the aftermath of the Second World War. Gorman’s study is more modest, however. He limits his examination to the 1920s and early 1930s, focusing on how liberal, internationally minded individuals in America and from different corners of the British Empire drew on interpersonal connections to set goals and identify productive areas for compromise. Gorman characterizes this activity as pragmatic or nonnaive idealism, and he argues that it gave rise to a liberal internationalism that was able to transcend—at least briefly—continental European preoccupation with the role of force in global security (3–4).

To examine this set of Anglophone internationalists, Gorman’s text offers a loose confederation of six case studies examined over the course of nine chapters. The case studies in section 1 center on the interplay of local, imperial, and international contexts in creating a role for the Dominions (Canada in particular) in League proceedings (chapter 1); in seeking citizenship for Indian settlers in East Africa (chapter 4); in forging an effective campaign to combat the trafficking of women and children (chapters 2 and 3); and in staging international sports competitions such as the British Empire Games of 1930 (chapter 5). Section 2 begins with an examination of two different Anglo-American arenas for discussion of new types of transnational collaboration. These include British and American organizations promoting the League of Nations (chapter 6) and a set of church-based organizations (chapter 7). Chapters 8 and 9 discuss the creation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, which renounced the unilateral use of military force in international disputes. Despite the pact’s obvious failure, Gorman scores it as a victory for pragmatism precisely because its proponents agreed on a compromise text and deferred the thorny specifics of the pact’s enforcement. Gorman admits, of course, that this willingness to agree to a toothless text did not make the pact pragmatic in the sense of being enforceable. Nevertheless, he stresses that the pact did help to shift diplomatic negotiations to a more collaborative, international framework, the type that would reemerge after the Second World War. Here, however, as in each of the other case studies, Gorman follows his case up to the early 1930s and does not connect it to its successors in the postwar world.

Each case study is thoroughly researched, and Gorman ably evokes the world of 1920s internationalism, explaining along the way how each set of activists arrived at their knowledge of and interest in transnational collaboration. He brings their experiences as well as their tactics in promoting international society to life. Gorman is at his best in this endeavor, and readers will gain deeper insights about the period from his hints at comparisons between his cases and neighboring studies. His analysis of the intellectual connections between British and American pro-League associations, for example, adds a fascinating dimension to Helen McCarthy’s study of the League of Nations Union (*The British People and the League of Nations: Democracy, Citizenship and Internationalism, c. 1918–45* [Manchester, 2011]). His analysis of Indian citizenship in East Africa expands the argument of his first book, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging* (Manchester, 2006), beyond the white Dominions. Other chapters seem more redundant, as does his examination of the human trafficking in light of Barbara Metzger’s “Towards an International Human Rights Regime during the Interwar Years: The League of Nations’ Combat of Traffic in Women and Children” (in *Beyond Sovereignty: Britain, Empire and Transnationalism, c. 1880–1950* [2007]) and Gorman’s own “Empire, Internationalism, and the Campaign against the Traffic in Women and Children in the 1920s” (*Twentieth Century British History* 19, no. 2 [2008]: 186–216).

This repetition would be less of a shortcoming if Gorman more clearly synthesized his six case studies. As they stand, however, both his introduction and his conclusion resort to “also’s” in lieu of integrated analysis, though the conclusion is clearer than the introduction. The text thus leaves the reader to wonder about possible connections between, on the one hand, the examples of activism that populate the book’s first section and, on the other hand, the Anglo-American efforts to promote transnational cooperation that occupy the book’s second half. One wonders whether the intellectual and voluntary networks discussed in the latter helped to give rise to the strategies and collaborations explored in section I. If so, the second section should perhaps have come first in order to make that argument. These possibilities are tantalizing, but the analytic promise of the book never truly comes together.

Caroline E. Sham, Bates College

S. J. D. GREEN AND PEREGRINE HORDEN, eds. *All Souls and the Wider World: Statesmen, Scholars, and Adventurers, c. 1850–1950*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. 352. \$135.00 (cloth).

doi: 10.1017/jbr.2013.95

Isaiah Berlin, at a dinner at Corpus Christi College to celebrate his eightieth birthday, compared Oxford’s colleges to various countries. Christ Church was like France (grand and aristocratic). New College was like England (solid, unimaginative, and run by Wykemists). Balliol was like the United States (brash and multiracial). Corpus Christi was Denmark (small, orderly, and universally admired). All Souls was like the Vatican: it had no subjects and claimed a close relationship with another world. In the present volume, following essays by Adrian Wooldridge and Simon Green on All Souls’ prize fellowships, there are essays about All Souls and the wider world to which the title of this book refers: on Sir John Simon (Stephen Cretney), on R. H. Brand (Green), on W. K. Hancock (Jim Davidson), on the “Round Table” (Michael Howard), on Germany (John Clarke), two essays on India (Sarvepalli Gopal), on appeasement (Green again), an essay on Leo Amery and one on the Suez crisis (both by Roger Lewis), and on G. M. Young (Mordaunt Crook). These are all stylish essays, packed with the detailed research one would expect of these distinguished authors. This volume succeeds a previous collection of essays edited by Green and Horden, *All Souls Under the Ancien Régime: Politics Learning and the Arts, c. 1600–1850* (Oxford, 2007), and it will be followed by Simon Green’s *The Exceptional College: All Souls, 1850–1950* (Oxford, forthcoming).

As it moved into the twentieth century, All Souls was very much the creature of William Anson, its first lay warden and, indeed, its second founder. He converted it from an intellectual backwater into a powerful center for the study of law and history. It became “an exceptional college, a curious amalgam of university professors and Prize Fellows” (3). At a time in which university reformers urged other colleges to convert their fellowships into offices for college and university teaching, All Souls preserved its, and these fellowships became prize fellowships truly. Prize fellowships, allocated on the basis of open competition rather than kinship or locality, transformed the university from a seminary into an institution for secular learning. In the whole of Oxford (excepting All Souls) between 1878 and 1914, there were 128 prize fellowship elections, and fully half of those holding them took up academic posts in the university. By itself All Souls elected 63 prize fellows in the same period. Of these only 10 became scholars, devoting their lives to research. Seventeen became lawyers, 12 became politicians or public servants, 6 became writers or journalists, and 5 became bankers. This is not to minimize their contributions to learning. When Sir Frederick Pollock came to Oxford as