

to him and in 1953 he moved to the Beth-El Hospital in Brooklyn, a community hospital which he transformed into an academic institution before he retired in 1965.

Snapper's notes include his own idiosyncratic views on medical education, as well as comments on medicine and medical life in the modern world. He is described as "the champion of bedside medicine"—there were however many others of his era who would deserve that title. Clearly the editor has had difficulties with Snapper's English, which cannot have been easy to transcribe. There are many errors. For example when Snapper describes his delight, after his Chinese episode, in rediscovering "Ladburys chocolate", surely it was Cadburys. Nevertheless, this is an admirable autobiographical account of the career of a fascinating Dutchman who inspired all who benefited from his teaching. As the author states, it will be a vitally important source for the scientific biography of Snapper still to be written.

Christopher Booth,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of
Medicine at UCL

Sonu Shamdasani, *Jung and the making of modern psychology: the dream of a science*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. xvi, 387, £50.00, US\$75.00 (hardback 0-521-83145-8); £18.95, US\$28.00 (paperback 0-521-53909-9).

This remarkable book has been out for some time and so this review aims both to re-iterate some of what its achievements are as well as reflecting on the lessons that historians and biographers might learn from it. That Shamdasani has done an enormous amount of close reading of both primary and secondary texts is not surprising for those of us who have read his earlier publications; he was fortunate in the case of Jung because he has not merely read Jung's already published works, he also had access to material not seen before, all of which figure in the book in differing ways and to differing purposes. Shamdasani makes charmingly clear what his methodological loyalties are: they are to the jazz musicianship of Ornette Coleman and John

Coltrane and the peculiar and cubist writings of Jorge Luis Borges and Fernando Pessoa. So the hope is going to be that he can tell his scholarly story in the form of spacious, almost free form, music and words: that a minimum of interest will be taken in the merely biographical and the maximum in historical context, historical contingency and often hilarious historical twists and turns. To put it at its simplest, he takes a person, or an idea of a person, or a fantasy of a person called "Jung" and shows us that this "Jung" never existed, except in the mythologies required by others. These others are not playing jazz, not seeing, for example, the myriad ways in which Jung—an actual Jung—insisted on the elusive nature of almost all psychological matters and loathed the way that his ideas were formalized, restricted and traduced. Jung was on the jazz side; "Jung" was deprived of all that openness and became a mere frozen version of a complex past. Again, to be simple: I have read "Jung", I teach "Jung", I have even judged "Jung" and "Jungians". I now see that I knew nothing.

The key thing that Shamdasani does is carefully to locate his subject within the explosion that was the psychological sciences from the late nineteenth century onwards. And the aim of "psychology", starting in those decades, was to be nothing less than the unification of all the other human sciences, the completion of the circle. It had to be learned—immensely learned—to even begin to get close to that and Jung himself thought of a lot of his work as premature because of that learned aim and its burdens. (Shamdasani evokes very nicely some of the layout of Jung's personal library as a means of showing the reader just what a scale the book collecting and the reading had to be on). Crucially, if the desired homogeneity did not come about, leading to many "psychologies" all jostling together—well, for the moment, so be it. To speak of Jungian psychology in the singular was to miss the whole point, just as later in his career Jung was to be infuriated by the corrupt way that his studies of introversion and extraversion, his studies of psychological types, the complex grounds for his work on religions, were co-opted and simplified and

put to others' uses, while being deemed the work of "Jung".

Jung and the making of modern psychology is in fact a masterful history of an amazing range of topics—the history of philosophy, of dreams, of bodies and souls, of anthropology, of religion and of magical ceremonies, because it is at the interface of all of these that Jung wished to somehow unite them all—or die trying. As Shamdasani writes that history up, he both annihilates past "Jungs" and summons Carl Jung himself, the Jung who kept moving, kept going back and then forward and back and forward. The essential point for Jung from the 1900s was the matter of the subjectivity of the observer, how all observation involved that and defined the act of observation itself. Psychologies such as those of Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920), which proposed that experiment and statistics could put aside the subjective, put aside the "personal equation", were never going to be satisfactory or even scientific. None of this meant that there could not, one day, be an objective psychology but it required that all the subjectivities be examined and their common aspects (their shared symbolic aspects, say) be understood. To take the one figure whom those who think of "Jung" see as a master to Jung's pupil, Sigmund Freud: Shamdasani does a wonderful job of explaining why Jung saw Freud's own neurosis as limiting psychoanalysis, of why Freud's refusal to even discuss this, or even be analysed himself, all put paid to the Freudian project. Freud laid down his law about dreams as disguised wish fulfilments, refused to countenance the possibility that some dreams did not fit in that category and (in a fine phrase from Shamdasani) "privatised the dream". Jung had to re-collectivize the dream and recover its metaphysical and religious significance, recover all the subjective dreamers in the human race and then—but only then—uncover what united all their dreams and eventually united all their collective unconsciousnesses. Of course—but this is Shamdasani's point and hence his book's sub-title—this project might itself be a dream and specifically a dream of a science. But what a dream, both vast and risking parody and "scientific" ridicule, because (the book's last

chapters address this) Jung had rumbled his version of the social pathology of modern life. On the surface, we have collective consciousness and mass man and a diluted religious world. It was the failure of religion to provide a counterweight to all this that was the curse of modernity and it was Jung's dream that the collective *unconscious* would be understood, celebrated and save the Western world. Complex psychology was the name for that last hope and it is typical of both Shamdasani's book and of his Jung that we now see how little Jung thought that this act of recognition would ever occur, let alone succeed.

To write a book like this and combine originality, historical accuracy, an understanding of improvisation in historical actors—all without partisanship—is truly special. And to see similarities between the careers (variations in technique and approach, new themes, new understandings and misunderstandings) of Carl Jung and Miles Davis—that folks, is jazz and we might all learn to play in the same vein.

Michael Neve,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of
Medicine at UCL

Pratik Chakrabarti, *Western science in modern India: metropolitan methods, colonial practices*, The 'Opus 1' series, New Delhi, Permanent Black, 2004, pp. xi, 328, Rs 695 (hardback, 81-7824-078-5).

The relation between science and nationalism in India is indeed an ambiguous one. As is well known, Gandhi was highly critical of western science. In *Hind Swaraj*, for instance, he advised that Indians "should abandon the pretension of learning many sciences", and suggested instead that ethical and religious education ought to "occupy the first place". Almost forty years later Nehru in *The Discovery of India* took exactly the opposite view. Although he admired classic literature, he emphasized the need for scientific training in physics, chemistry and biology for the younger generation: "Only thus can they understand and fit into the modern world and develop, to some extent at least, the scientific