

strated that idealism was much more pervasive in Britain than is often acknowledged, particularly in the area of Victorian political culture (p. 6). But a recognition that idealism played a larger role in late nineteenth-century Britain does not necessarily lead to her conclusion that by the mid-1880s idealism “became the primary school of thought in Britain” (p. 1). Den Otter herself offers little support for this statement since the bulk of the book centres on the social thought of the British idealists, not on their impact. Surely the hold of scientific naturalism, of the Huxleys and Tyndalls, the heirs to the utilitarian and native empiricist tradition, was not dislodged merely by the idealists, as Den Otter seems to imply. We must take into account the role of other intellectual groups who were equally dissatisfied with the reign of scientific naturalism, such as members of the Tory-Anglican elite like Arthur Balfour or thinkers like James Ward and A. R. Wallace, who have been dealt with by Frank Turner in his *Between Science and Religion*. Den Otter has made an important contribution to the field, however, by helping scholars to see why British idealism was so pervasive at the end of the nineteenth century, and she has provided us with a better understanding of why the authority of scientific naturalism was not as solid as has often been believed.

Bernard Lightman
York University

Roy Douglas — *The Great War, 1914–1918: The Cartoonists’ Vision*. London: Routledge, 1995. Pp. vii, 157.

In a single image, newspaper cartoonists can capture, sometimes more effectively than academic treatises, the factors that defined issues and events of the day. Certainly this is a point appreciated by Roy Douglas, who has now written his fourth book relying upon the work of illustrators to describe political and social currents between the mid-nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries. In this volume, Douglas fills in a short but crucial gap in that time frame, for clearly the Great War represented a cataclysmic event in world history. Douglas has gathered newspaper illustrations from practically every belligerent nation spanning from the outbreak of hostilities until the formation of the League of Nations, providing English translations where necessary. The selections demonstrate not only the role played by newspaper cartoonists as unofficial propagandists in reflecting and reinforcing jingoism and naiveté about battle, but also, on occasion, their foreshadowing of the disillusionment that multitudes, particularly soldiers, carried out of this conflict.

This is an important subject, and cartoons certainly represent an under-utilized historical source. But this book attempts to accomplish its goal — a general history of World War I through newspaper illustrations — in too few pages. The disappointing pattern is established at the outset with a four-page general introduction that would have served far better as a short history of wartime cartooning rather than as a thumbnail sketch of the factors that led to the outbreak of war. Most of the individual chapters are comprised of a one- to two-page preface followed by

approximately ten cartoons with brief explanatory notes — a structure that ultimately explains little and produces a choppy, disjointed style. Cartoons from a number of countries should have been eliminated because they tend to raise more questions than they answer. For example, the very complex war experiences of Canada, Australia, and South Africa are each covered in two or three cartoons. Moreover, Douglas fails to state why certain newspapers were chosen to provide illustrations for the text; indeed, one gets the impression that this decision was based upon what could be obtained most easily. In any event, the result does not provide any regional, religious, or class-based cross-representation of newspapers that in several countries produced disparate outlooks upon the war and spoke to important internal divisions. Also left unaddressed is the crucial matter of censorship policies, even though Douglas expresses surprise that some rather macabre illustrations, such as several from France, were allowed into print. One comes away from this slender volume with the feeling that it would have been far better if Douglas had undertaken an intensive rather than extensive approach — namely one that focused upon cartoons in the newspapers of just two or three principal belligerents — which would have allowed him to explore a wider array of sources and issues.

There are a number of recently published books that demonstrate the tremendous potential of cartoons as historical evidence, including for the study of warfare. Unfortunately, this volume comes up short by furnishing, both in pictorial and written formats, a far too brief and cursory analysis that primarily ends up reinforcing some well-established points and interpretations. Although its scholarly use is marginal, Douglas's book may find an audience among cartoon buffs. Yet one suspects that, even among such fans, the outrageous price of \$105 Canadian will limit the appeal of this book.

Jeff Keshen
University of Ottawa

Alexander de Grand — *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany: The "Fascist" Style of Rule*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Pp. xviii, 102.

Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany is part of a series, "Historical Connections", intended for those studying and teaching history. The series attempts to provide its audience with a synthesis of the research on a particular topic to date, in an effort to overcome the fragmented nature of much history undertaken today, and such is Alexander de Grand's task. It is an ambitious and admirable goal but a challenging one, especially given the extreme brevity of the book and the topic addressed.

De Grand's comparison is carefully restricted to Hitler's Nazi regime in Germany and Mussolini's Fascist regime in Italy at the level of practical politics and the implementation of policy. He deliberately avoids a comparison of the two ideologies and the whole debate over what constituted fascism and which regimes were truly fascist. He focuses on the regimes, their respective state structures, and the policies implemented, pointing out the similarities and differences between Fascism and