

Quaker, the Tukes of York who released the insane from bondage, and the neurologist Hughlings Jackson. Clifford Allbutt, future Regius Professor at the University of Cambridge, was physician to the Leeds Infirmary, whilst Berkeley Moynihan, who forever did away with the idea that the surgeon was no more than a rough and ready sawbones, became the first and virtually the only provincial to become President of the Royal College of Surgeons. William Pickles of Wensleydale became the first President of the Royal College of General Practitioners. But this book tells us so much more. It is not generally appreciated that Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici* was written whilst he was practising in Halifax nor that David Ferrier had so great an influence on the recognition of the importance of cerebral localization whilst working at the West Riding Lunatic Asylum. There was also the important work of medical artists. John Burton, portrayed as Dr Slop in *Tristram Shandy*, was a remarkable anatomical illustrator, as was his friend, George Stubbs, much of whose early work was carried out in Yorkshire. Not content with the modern era, Dr Parsons is an expert on the stained glass windows of York Minister which portray medical events. This engaging volume is to be recommended to all who appreciate the importance of local history. It is well written. Sadly, however, there is no index.

Christopher Booth,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the
History of Medicine at UCL

Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra and Hilary Marland, *Cultures of child health in Britain and the Netherlands in the twentieth century*, *Clio Medica* 71, The Wellcome Series in the History of Medicine, Amsterdam and New York, Rodopi, 2003, pp. vi, 317 (hardback 90-420-1054-1), (paperback 90-420-1044-4).

In 1999 a group of Dutch and British historians working in child health gathered at Warwick University for a workshop on 'Child health and national fitness in the twentieth century'. National fitness emerged as a less important

unifying theme to the workshop than had been anticipated. As the editors wrote in the introduction to the volume which emerged from the workshop, the dominance of "national efficiency" was challenged. National efficiency was still viewed as a central motivating factor for child welfare and health in early-twentieth-century Britain by those who wrote on that subject; for example in his chapter on mental deficiency, Mark Jackson cited an early-twentieth-century doctor who proclaimed: "The hand that *wrecks* the cradle *wrecks* the nation" (p. 157). Yet it was also shown to be time and place specific. The Dutch historians argued that national fitness was less important in discourses of child health than the "pillared" denominational society of early-twentieth-century Netherlands. Other papers focusing on post-Second World War societies showed that concerns of national fitness had given way to other considerations based on social changes and the new child psychology (such as the "separation anxiety" discussed by Harry Hendrick, the sexual revolution discussed by Hugo Röling, and the anti-psychiatry movement and youth culture discussed by Gemma Blok). This collection of essays highlights the importance of viewing the history of child health in its broader social and cultural context, and the value of comparative history in the unravelling of those contextual constructions.

The history of children's health covers a multiplicity of subject areas and this volume is no exception. The subjects range from physical education in schools, the school medical service and educational reform, infant care advice and consumerism, mental deficiency, children's and adolescent residential institutions, corporal punishment, hospital visiting, and sex education. The editors define "the child" as being school aged, between the ages of four and fourteen, and note that most of the essays focus on this age group. However, three deal with infants, and two with adolescents (defined as between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five). In his overview chapter, Roger Cooter laments the continued "adultist" approach to the historical study of children and the lack of children's voice, though he sees Hendrick's essay on hospital visiting as

Book Reviews

“hinting” at a history of children’s own experience of illness and medicine. Deborah Thom perhaps comes closest to uncovering children’s views when she uses oral history to assess the extent of physical punishment in the home and at school.

One of the goals of the workshop was to reflect upon advances in the historiography of child health since the publication of Roger Cooter’s landmark collection of essays, *In the name of the child: health and welfare 1880–1940* (1992). For this reason Cooter was invited to contribute the final chapter of this book. Cooter regretted that children had still not become a major focus for historical research except in relation to more general historical agendas or in connection with specific foci, such as the history of sports, masculinity and “mental defectives”. Yet the fifth conference of the European Association for the History of Medicine, held in Geneva in 2001 and entitled ‘Health and the child: care and culture in history’ demonstrates that the situation is not as bleak as indicated by Cooter. This conference attracted over 90 papers and 120 participants. Unfortunately no publication has emerged from the meeting (though some of the participants contributed to the present volume). This contrasts with another conference held the previous year, at the University of Michigan, which resulted in *Formative years: children’s health in the US, 1800–2000* edited by Alexandra Minna Stern and Howard Markel (2002). Child health does appear to be developing its own specific historiography and this volume is an important contribution.

Linda Bryder,
University of Auckland

John Waller, *Fabulous science: fact and fiction in the history of scientific discovery*, Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. xi, 308, illus., £18.99 (hardback 0-19-280404-9).

Clearly intended for the “popular” market, Waller’s book leaves a lot to be desired as far as the readership of this journal will be concerned. In spite of the author’s repeated attempts to point to the unifying themes of his book, it comes

across to the reader who knows something about the history of science and medicine, or something about the philosophy and sociology of science as a ragbag of *causes célèbres* of such differing kinds that it presents no sound conclusions about the nature of modern science.

Divided into two parts, the first presents five case studies which reveal “conduct unbecoming of a good scientist” (p. 284), by “distorting experimental results until they are consistent with strongly held beliefs” (p. 110), and could be said, therefore, to be concerned with the nature of science itself. The eight case studies of the second part are said to be concerned with “offences committed against the historical record” (p. 284), by inventing myths to displace historical truths. The naïve reader will no doubt be persuaded. The not so innocent reader will wonder, however, whether it is legitimate to include a notorious case of the dangers of scientism, Frederick Taylor’s “scientific management”, or a clear case of ideologically driven “science”, the “Hawthorne Experiment”, alongside Robert Millikan’s attempts to measure the charge on the electron, or Arthur Eddington’s attempts to confirm general relativity, or Louis Pasteur’s efforts to disprove spontaneous generation (even granting the ideological dimension to these efforts). The lessons of each case study do not build up to provide a cumulative picture of the dangers or pitfalls of the experimental method, or of the institutional organization of science, they simply remain interesting cases in their own right.

Some readers of this review will already have noted that there is nothing original in Waller’s choice of case studies either. It is clear from reading his accounts that they are entirely derivative upon earlier studies; often a single study (John Farley and Gerald Geison on the Pasteur-Pouchet debate, Gerald Holton on Millikan, John Earman and Clark Glymour on Eddington). Waller talks throughout of the importance of history for understanding the nature of science, but by repeating familiar case studies he is in danger of showing the poverty of historicism. Instead of repeating old lessons of history, wouldn’t it be better to reinforce them with new case studies?