but for those who are not or for the general reader such footnoting is so worthless as to render the exercise pointless.

Having said that, Wright deals efficiently enough with Wolseley's South African interlude. Wright also catches Wolseley's character well. He does make a significant contribution in arguing that the Zululand settlement was influenced more by Sir Henry Bulwer, Sir Theophilus Shepstone and, especially, John Wesley Shepstone than previously suggested. He finds no evidence that it was modelled on George Colley's Indian experience, as is usually contended. The most original section is that devoted to the Sekhukhune campaign, Wright correctly asserting that it is the first full account beyond a few articles. John Laband only touched on it briefly in his recent Zulu Warriors: The Battle for the South African Frontier (2014). It was a campaign in which the British took the offensive and Wright's own viewing of the terrain emphasises the physical difficulties to be overcome in doing so. Nonetheless, apart from the desire of the Duke of Cambridge and other enemies to denigrate Wolseley's achievements, it is understandable that 56 white dead did not appear worthy of a clasp for all that the campaign also probably cost the lives of 600 Swazi allies and perhaps 1,000 baPedi.

There are a few errors. It is generally accepted, for example, that Pulleine was not killed in his tent at Isandlwana. Overall, however, Wright has provided a lively account for the general reader.

IAN F. W. BECKETT
University of Kent


World War I or the Great War (1914-1918) has in recent years become a topic of great interest among non-western historians and although most of the fighting occurred in Europe and the Middle East, there were significant campaigns fought elsewhere. In East Asia, Japan dramatically enhanced its strategic position by acquiring German possessions there and, by acquiring a number of Pacific islands, this expanded Japan’s geographical reach and laid the groundwork for a larger Japanese maritime empire. The war also afforded Japan the opportunity to deliver its “Twenty-One Demands” to China in 1915 and demonstrated Japan’s interest in realising its continental ambitions. But everywhere, the end of the war brought change, not just because of the disruptions to global commerce, the spread of influenza, and the emergence of Communism as a serious political force in Asia.
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generally, but also because of the shift to the internationalism of the 1920s. Nevertheless, the historiography on the impact of the war in Asia has focused on the issue through national lenses and has been a historiography generally produced by Western scholars. This is the first study by an Asian scholar to examine the impact of World War I on select societies that represent Asia as a whole.

To provide representative coverage of Asia, the author looks at five main examples, including one French colony (French Indochina), one British colony (India), and one Japanese colony (Korea), as well as Japan and China. This leaves out many other interesting cases, including Siam, which sent an expeditionary force to France, and the Dutch East Indies, which would have been a constant variable given that the Netherlands remained neutral and unoccupied during the war. Nevertheless, the scope of the project might otherwise have been too unwieldy. The author also emphasises the shared aspects of the historical experience rather than providing comprehensive coverage even for identified main foci. Japan’s identity crisis after the defeat of Germany, a country that it had used as a special model for its own modernization has been well covered in previous literature. The present volume examines broader disappointment as an Asian phenomenon. Xu argues that the biggest shared experiences were the “soaring expectations” for the war and the “humiliating disappointments” that resulted from the conflict’s outcomes. President Wilson’s “fourteen Points” speech gave Asian peoples the hope of an equal place at the table with European countries that would not ultimately be realised (p. 7). Most disappointed was China, which had declared war on Germany and sent a labour corps, but which found that its position in the postwar world remained that of a third-rate nation, and below Japan in the international hierarchy of states.

The book provides only one possible approach to telling the story of the shared experience of the war in Asia and in this case the story is heavily weighted to Chinese and Japanese experience. The book, for example, is divided into 8 chapters. Chapters 1, 2, 6, and 7 focus on Japan and China, while the remaining chapters are each devoted to a colonial case study, including India, Vietnam, and Korea. This arrangement makes sense in terms of thematic representation, but it gives the feel of the colonial case studies being appendages to a larger East Asian story, something historians of Southeast Asia might not find appealing. Further, although Koreans were inspired by Wilson’s Fourteen Points, this reviewer wonders whether there is enough here to warrant an entire chapter when some countries more directly and dramatically impacted by the war were left out? Instead, the main story arcs in the book are Japan’s failed desires for a new world order that would cement its position as a world power and China’s failed hopes to recover what it had lost to the Japanese. Likewise, Chapter 8 focuses on the same two countries (plus India) in
discussing the war's intellectual impact. This includes lost respect for Western powers, the discrediting of Western morality, and rethinking about the relationship between European and Asian civilization, which helped fuel an intensification of the discourse on Pan-Asianism in Japan, China, and India.

Xu correctly points to a gap in knowledge in Asia regarding Asian involvement in World War I as a justification for writing this book and he explains in the conclusion that he hopes his book has begun to fill it. There is no doubt that Xu has achieved his goal. This is an important book and one that many historians of different Asian societies will benefit from reading and considering. It will also help to further push historians out of their national historiographical silos and to consider broader historical developments comparatively.

MICHAEL W. CHARNEY
SOAS, University of London


Aftershock is an important and eye-opening study of the traumatic psychological effects of war on British military personnel. It deals with the harrowing ordeal some veterans and their families undergo in the aftermath of their exposure to war’s realities. The book consists of two main parts. The first explores the ways in which many British ex-forces personnel are, as Green puts it, “still fighting wars in their minds” long after their involvement with the military had come to an end. Many soldiers returning from war can face a downward spiral, including alcohol abuse, relationship breakdown, angry outbursts, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (or PTSD), prison, homelessness and even suicide. The second part goes beyond understanding how war breaks people. Here the author uncovers the challenges that ex-servicemen and women face when navigating the transition to civilian life and the networks of help available to them on their path to healing. Part II argues that while the NHS and various charities offer a good range of options, the lack of coordination between these competing resources often means that help doesn’t reach those who need it most. Moreover, the treatment options traditionally offered by mainstream health providers lag behind the most recent research into how trauma affects the structure and biology of the brain. Consequently, they fail to incorporate emerging methods of treatment that take these new approaches on board.

Green’s book brings fascinating material to the reader’s attention through a compelling, sensitive and often moving study. He undertakes the challenge of