world economy. These branches lead into Olstein's discussion about the difference, if not subtle rivalry, between world history and global history in Chapter 7. At the centre of the debate between the two histories is how to study, write, and teach the chronology and periodization of globalization. The problem may very well be one of definition. But it is also one of context. Chapter 8 addresses the contextual problem. For example, the contrast between Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper's *Empires in world history: power and the politics of difference* and John Darwin's *After Tamerlane: the rise and fall of global empires, 1400–2000* illustrates how the chronological divide between world history and global history is also a contextual divide.[2] That divide can highlight long-term patterns as in the Burbank and Cooper book or it can reveal modern processes as in the Darwin book. One possible bridge over the divide is big history, which embraces all aspects of life.

In Chapter 9, Olstein concludes this extended historiographical review and engaged intellectual history with a case study. He applies the four strategies and the twelve branches to the First World War. While primarily a violent argument among European industrialized powers, the conflict had a direct and indirect effect upon non-industrialized societies, communities, and peoples on land and sea. It was a world war. It was a global affair. And it was big history. At the end of the book, Olstein provides what he calls an 'analytical bibliography'; it is a valuable and informed bibliography, which organizes global historiography into teaching and research categories.

Mature students, advanced researchers, and the intellectually curious will find *Thinking history globally* a welcomed addition to their libraries. After all, humanity now lives in the era of the global intercommunicating zone which is the whole world.

Lester P. Lee, Jr
Suffolk University, USA
E-mail: llee@suffolk.edu
doi:10.1017/S1740022818000402

Colonial captivity during the First World War: internment and the fall of the German empire, 1914–1919, by Mahon Murphy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xiii + 245. 2 maps. Hardback £75.00, ISBN: 978-1-108-41807-2.

Musing on the nature of conflict, the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher Heraclitus alerted us to the transformative power of war. 'War', he argued, 'is the father of all, king of everything.' The First World War, as an example of this maxim, profoundly altered the political, social, and cultural landscape of the early twentieth century. It represented both opportunity and loss: toppling the political order, subverting convention, and challenging the practice of imperial rule. The First World War, in short, was a catalyst for change. This interpretation, of course, is not new. However, on occasion, refreshingly new perspectives bring attention to the way in which this change occurred. Mahon Murphy's *Colonial captivity during the First World War* is one such example. Focusing on the German experience, Murphy offers a stimulating account of war's effect on empires and colonies and more particularly on how the experience of First World War internment undermined imperial influence and colonial rule while transforming the future of both.

Britain, France, and other belligerents during the First World War, seeking to lay eventual claim to seized territory in Africa, the Middle East, and Australasia, looked to remove enemy colonialists from these lands by way of internment and repatriation. To this end, indigenous troops were used, an action that would necessarily upend the prevailing racial hierarchy that

[2]Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in world history: power and the politics of difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010; John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: the rise and fall of global empires, 1400–2000*, London: Allen Lane, 2007.

legitimated colonial rule in the first instance. The imprisonment and guarding of colonials as prisoners of war by black, Indian, and other indigenous troops (as well as the use of the 'enemy prisoner' narrative for propaganda purposes) reinforced perceptions of the historical reversal in racial roles, dispelling the myth of the 'civilizing hand' of colonial rule. As Professor Murphy makes clear, it helped destroy the delicate balance of pre-war, intercolonial cooperation in the global hinterland. The hope, of course, among colonialists was that the imperative of maintaining racial control in the colonies would supersede the political differences and conflict between European adversaries. This prospect, however, would come to naught. The First World War would demonstrate that the conflict was 'total' in every respect.

The imperial contest between the European powers undercut the colonializing mission. But more deeply, as Murphy explains, it changed the lives of the colonialists whose fate was tied to the metropole. In the war between Germany and Britain, where military and strategic advantage was always at issue, colonialists would become hostages in the political power play between the adversaries. Murphy explores how lives were affected, seamlessly weaving personal accounts of internment with global developments. The result is a rich and colourful narrative that describes the way in which the differential treatment of certain categories of individuals during internment hardened class and national distinctions, forcing among the captives a reassessment of colonial identities and roles while supplanting the imperial hold on the political imagination. As their world came crashing down around them, Murphy reminds us that war can – and often does – change everything.

Although focusing on the German experience, the real strength of the book lies in its comparative approach and analysis. Comparison highlights the fact that internment was widely used as an instrument of war and that First World War internment was truly a global affair. Other comparative studies, of course, make this same point. Heather Jones's *Violence against prisoners of war in the First World War* immediately comes to mind.[3] But the sheer scope of Murphy's investigation – ranging from Africa to the Middle East, Australasia to Canada, and points in between – makes *Colonial captivity* an impressive work. Attempting to make sense of internment as a global experience, it is an ambitious effort – one that enables the author to make a number of important arguments.

First, serving traditional policy goals, the vast centralized network of camps in the British empire added a distinctly 'modern' dimension to the conflict. The internment of civilians as prisoners of war in the far reaches of the globe represented a new and ambitious form of organized violence, the magnitude of which was seen as vital to achieving war's objectives. Although Murphy is not explicit in this regard, we draw from his description certain conclusions. The scope, scale, and nature of First World War internment was precedent-setting, giving credence to certain ideas associated with total war that would further serve as a prescription to innovation in future war-making.

Comparison also makes evident that local conditions undermined the British effort at coordinating and controlling internment as an imperial undertaking. Murphy looks to understand and explain how, for example, in the dominions local expressions of political cultural identity complicated the imperial policy on internment. In the hinterland, among ardent supporters, internment was meant to give an advantage to the imperial project. However, zealousness led to abuses that made diplomacy problematic and even jeopardized wider political interests. Meanwhile, dominion governments used internment to address local needs and concerns, in the process helping to establish their authority and sovereignty. But this, too, problematized the mission and mandate of imperial control over policy. Murphy advances the thesis that specific conditions translated into differences in practice, a development that only comparative analysis could reveal.

[3]Heather Jones, *Violence against prisoners of war in the First World War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Finally, Murphy draws attention to the various national differences in the global practice of internment. He observes that internment in Japan was not the same as in Germany, while American or Portuguese internment had little in common with the British or French experience. How then to account for these discrepancies? Murphy makes the case that stakes in the conflict had bearing on behaviour: the higher the stakes, the more assertive the use of internment. Where interests were less at risk, the more anodyne the policy and practice of internment. The evidence appears to support this contention. But is the linkage definitive? How, for example, does Canadian internment fit in? As a settler society with significant numbers of German and east-central European immigrants, Canada resorted to punitive measures that underscored the harsh treatment of enemy aliens on Canadian soil. How does national policy, originally informed by wider political considerations and objectives, become subordinate to local concerns and needs? Moreover, what are we to make of the argument in this case that political stakes relating to the war determined the nature of internment? War for Canada was distant and not immediate. How then are we to explain the cruelty and viciousness of the practice of internment in that country? Further comparative work is required to answer these and other questions.

Colonial captivity is an invaluable resource for those interested in the study of internment and for those who would look to understand both the First World War and the colonial experience. It provides a solid foundation for further comparative work, offering useful insights and perspectives.

Bohdan S. Kordan
University of Saskatchewan, Canada
E-mail: bkordan@stmcollege.ca
doi:10.1017/S1740022818000414