

## Book Reviews

GLENN GRITZER AND ARNOLD ARLUKE, *The making of rehabilitation. A political economy of medical specialization, 1890–1980*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, University of California Press, 1985, 8vo, pp. xxiii, 214, £27.50.

This is one of the few attempts since Rosen's *The specialization of medicine* (1944) to comment on medical specialization through a focus on one particular area of medical practice. It offers a detailed account of how the people now providing what are known in America as rehabilitation services came to be organized into particular occupations with limited jurisdictions and specific positions in the health division of labour. Through this case study the authors challenge the view of medical specialization and subspecialization as the "inevitable" result of new technologies or as the "natural" consequence of the growth of scientific knowledge and skills. Like Gerald Larkin, through his examination of similar areas of British medical and para-medical practice (*Occupational monopoly and modern medicine* [1983]), Gritzer and Arluke perceive the occupational division of medical labour as the organizational outcome of "commodity services" competing in and for medical markets. Accordingly, they illustrate how the approach to specialist occupational autonomy hinges on the successful exploitation of historical events (such as the demands of war), and on successful strategies conducted, horizontally, against competing service commodities, and vertically, in relation to existing medical practices, on the one hand, and competing alternative medical practices (such as chiropractic and osteopathy) on the other.

As a well-researched history of the emergence, proliferation, organization, and struggles for market survival of the practitioners of the array of past and present "corrective therapies" in America (electro-, radio-, physio-, vocational, occupational, educational, etc.), this study offers as much to historians as to sociologists. Wisely, the authors include three appendices which provide a convenient chronological guide to the entangled medical and allied organizations involved, and to the many re- and re-titled official journals. But with the current situation of rehabilitation medicine apparently uppermost in the authors' minds (not least the interesting trend among the para-medical occupations away from hitherto sought-after legal and medical protection), and with over half of the book concentrated on the period after 1941, much of the early history is insufficiently explored and understood. Less excusable, given the authors' complaint against the "natural growth model" for projecting specialization as if it occurred "in a social and political vacuum" (p. 8), is the lack of historical contextualization. The two world wars figure prominently, but little is said of the role of industry or of sports, and nothing is made of the heavy involvement of women in the "allied occupations" discussed. Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of this book, however, is its failure to qualify the *general* value of the "market model" for comprehending medical specialization. One is left with the strong impression that rehabilitation medicine is the model's soft option; applied to other areas of medical specialization, the model may be as inappropriate and restrictive as the crude technological determinism that the authors attack. As Eliot Freidson admits in his foreword to the volume, it may not be so easy to discount the role of "a certain technical logic" within other areas of medicine and surgery; indeed, "just as there is more than one way to skin a cat, so there is more than one way to organize a division of labor." Likewise, there will always be more than one way to approach the history of medical specialization. Both the merits and the limitations of this book should encourage others to find out how.

Roger Cooter  
Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine  
University of Manchester

CLAUDE BERNARD, *Memoir on the pancreas and on the role of pancreatic juice in digestive processes*, translated by John Henderson, London, Academic Press, 1985, 4to, pp. x, 131, illus., [no price stated].

In the early nineteenth century, Britain was far behind France and Germany in the development of physiology. At that time, Claude Bernard was arguably the most distinguished experimental physiologist. His pupil, Paul Bert, said of him that in twenty years he found more