"release," and "natural urges," and indeed it seems as if all men's behaviors and desires are the same across space and time. The author argues at one point that, "no matter the colour of the uniform, *khaki, fledgrau,* or *bleu horizon*, underneath was a man with similar sexual needs and desires" (20). And the book's first paragraphs describe the sexual desires expressed by a British soldier in Iraq in 2003 (xii–xiii). Moreover, this is a tale told almost exclusively from male perspectives, with women largely confined to the role of object of male desires, "urges," and so on. The nature and absence of sources may make this all too inevitable, though, and Cherry does not flinch from describing with equal parts detail and imagination the likely motives and experiences of women wearing themselves out as prostitutes who "served" the "needs" of a mass army. So he concedes the importance of and does not ignore what he calls "the woman's story" (37), but admits several times how difficult it is to tell this story and resurrect the lived experiences. Finally, it is not clear why the author finds it so important to assess clinically himself the effect of sexual activity on military morale, rather than merely to explore, as much as is possible given typical reticence on the official record, the army's and the soldiers' assessment of this question. He even speculates that "such releases" may well have "helped prevent more men from getting nervous disorders, or assisted in early recovery from such" (230). These critiques aside, Bruce Cherry's fellow historians of the Great War are lucky to benefit from his meticulous research and dogged pursuit of an important aspect of soldiers' lives that all too often remains obscure.

Richard S. Fogarty
University at Albany, State University of New York
rfogarty@albany.edu

MARK CONNELLY. *Celluloid War Memorials: British Instructional Films Company and the Memory of the Great War*. Exeter Studies in Film History. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2016. Pp. 339. $93 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.152

Celluloid War Memorials, a new study by Mark Connelly, one of our best historians of war and popular culture, examines in detail the Great War films of one of the most important film producers of the interwar period. Neglected by many later commentators, the British Instructional Films Company's battlefield reconstructions were significant in the memorialization of the Great War and in the cultural struggle to remember the contribution of Britain and the empire to final victory.

H. Bruce Woolfe, who had served on the Western Front as an infantry officer, established the British Instructional Film Company in an army hut at Elstree. The company's reputation was made with the documentary series *Secrets of Nature*. These films pioneered new cinematographic techniques and were highly praised for their ability to combine educational elements with entertainment. But Woolfe soon turned his experience and the cinematographic skill of his team to the most important event in recent history, the Great War. His first project was a documentary reconstruction of the Battle of Jutland, based on the research of the historian Sir George Aston. Using models, maps, and a freeze-frame technique involving numerous tiny adjustments, *The Battle of Jutland* made sense of a highly confusing and contested battle for the general public. The film established itself as the definitive version of the battle and was highly praised by critics, audiences, and naval experts alike, who praised its educational value. Unsurprisingly, the film was also well received throughout the empire. Woolfe and Aston followed up their success with *Armageddon* (1923), a detailed examination of General Allenby's Palestine Campaign. Unfortunately, like *Jutland*, this film is now lost.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.152 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nevertheless, Connelly has used the available sources to put together a valuable examination of the project. With *Armageddon*, Woolfe broadened his technique, using available newsreel footage, stills, and battlefield reconstructions to fill gaps in the narrative. It was this use of reconstruction that gave *Armageddon*, and all British Instructional Film Company's subsequent productions, the emotional impact that allowed audiences to identify with the participants. The film was highly praised, and as Connelly notes, it "established BIF as a powerful new force in British cinema … . capable of innovation and hard-headed business insight to ensure the highest possible profile and profit margin for its products" (62).

Perhaps the highlights of British Instructional Film Company's productions were its reconstructions of the great battles on the Western Front, *Ypres* (1925) and *Mons* (1926). *Ypres*, which tells the story of the army's involvement with the "Holy Ground of the British Arms," was made with the cooperation of the War Office, which provided men, equipment, and location shooting facilities on Salisbury Plain. The film narrates the battles around Ypres from the first clash in 1914 though the 1917 Battle of Messines and the bloody fighting at Passchendaele. Based on extensive research, the film uses both genuine footage and reconstructions. In an attempt to show the "value of individual human efforts in shaping the outcome of events," it focused on the stories of fourteen individual soldiers. As Connelly points out, eleven of these stories are of "Victoria Cross winners and they reflect the glory of the whole Empire" (105). Premiered at the Marble Arch Pavilion, the film was a critical and commercial success throughout the empire, an unashamedly patriotic tribute to the nation and the British and Commonwealth armies. It was also the company's greatest commercial venture. Its sequel, *Mons,* was the story of the retreat of the British Expeditionary Force to the River Marne in the first year of the war. Generally well received by critics, *Mons* faced considerable competition from Hollywood's antiwar vision of the war as evidenced by *The Big Parade*, released around the same time (1925). The company made one final reconstruction before turning to conventional feature films, *The Battles of Coronel and Falkland Islands* (1927), a "hybrid between reconstruction and mainstream cinema in which the action was driven by attention on the main participants" (199). While actors played the leading participants, the film was an accurate recreation of the main events. *Coronel* had perhaps less impact than the company's earlier films, but it was, as Connelly argues, the "highpoint of British film production during the silent era" (245).

British Instructional Film Company's final film about the Great War was *Tell England* (1931), a conventional feature film based on Ernest Raymond's popular novel of the same name. After that, the company's big-budget films failed to maintain their traditionally high profit margins. With a lavish new studio at Welwyn and an expensive conversion to sound, the company was taken over by the giant British International Pictures. As Connelly points out, "It was largely the end of the road for these amazing titles and they slipped from public attention along with so much silent film regardless of its quality" (256). The last major screening of these battle reconstructions was in 1950 at the British Film Institute, when a series on silent film included *Coronel and Falklands Islands*. H. Bruce Woolfe later established Gaumont-British Instructional and continued making scientific and educational films. But as Connelly suggests, the British Instructional Film Company's battle reconstructions reveal a "concept of the Great War far removed from modern visions," embodying a "theme that has been largely ignored in memory studies and which requires wider investigation, namely, the deep connection between patriotism, remembrance/commemoration and profit" (269). The achievement was in the amazing breadth of the company's battle reconstructions—also, in the depiction of the extraordinary actions of ordinary men, which emphasized the immense endurance of the soldiers and sailors, as well as their earthy humor and good nature. Woolfe's company made frontline troops the driving force of their films. It is an enormous pity that today the films are unavailable for modern audiences. Mark Connelly's excellent book reconstructs a company that combined innovative filmmaking, patriotism, and profits,

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.152 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and in the process pushed the boundaries of filmmaking while commemorating the achievements of British arms during the Great War.

Michael Paris
University of Central Lancashire
mparis@uclan.ac.uk

CATHERINE GALLAGHER. *Telling It Like It Wasn't: The Counterfactual Imagination in History and Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018. $105 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.153

What if Napoleon had invaded Britain, or Hitler won the war? What if Alfredo di Stefano had signed for Barcelona instead of Real Madrid? The compulsion to counterfactual speculation informs every level of familiar exchange, from elaborate historical theories to pub talk. It shows no signs of diminishing in a world recently shaken by seemingly avoidable outcomes like the electoral victories of the Brexiteers and of Donald Trump. The project of Catherine Gallagher's *Telling It Like It Wasn't* is particularly timely right now as our politicians, for their own ends, unashamedly cultivate uncertainty over what is and is not a fact.

Gallagher claims that an appetite for the counterfactual exploded in the 1970s, so it shares an approximate chronology with the New Historicism in which she played a part, and which also showed an interest in secret histories (2)—another name for the anecdote—and a sense of the importance of "petites causes" (24). A further regeneration of speculative histories and novels came in the 1990s, with the breakup of the Soviet Empire and the emergence of a reunifying Germany along with the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Britain (139, 233). The remarkable development and dissemination of computer technology and gaming protocols adds to the mix. An invasion force or a handy tank battalion can now be conjured up with a tap on the keyboard.

It was in the war games of Clausewitz and his kind that the counterfactual rubber began to hit the virtual road. Among the protagonists was Henry Humphrey Evans Lloyd (c. 1718–1783), an entrepreneurial Welshman whose career will likely be as unfamiliar to many as it was to me: he is one of the first of many cases in which Gallagher has exhumed the lives and writings of the largely unremembered as critical exponents of her subject. She analyzes counterfactual history through the work of three French writers, Louis Geoffroy-Château (1803–1858), Charles Bernard Renouvier (1815–1903), and Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805–1881), about whom little has been written. The story of the counterfactual novel is also peopled by only a few familiar names—George Orwell and Hannah Arendt among them—along with extended expositions of the work of those who have not figured in the critical or historical canon.

Gallagher's ambition is admirably broad. She attempts a formal taxonomy of the genre (and its subgenres), with inspirations from philosophers and narratologists, and she lays down a new framework for categorizing the various options open to novelists and historians. Throughout, the application of thinking in the alternative to projects of social and political justice and potentially restorative legislations—"morally meaningful public action" (65) and "remedial legal thought" (132)—is made central to the argument. These novels and histories are part of an ethical project, most obviously so in the speculations about present-day race relations in the light of American history and reimagined Civil War narratives. Gallagher convincingly argues that speculative history has always been and still is at the core of Civil War debate, both in novels (Edmund Lawrence, Frank Williams, Ward Moore, Harry Turtledove) and in

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.152 Published online by Cambridge University Press