

Book Reviews

order. As the book progresses, the ratio of Pinelian writing to Postelian commentary steadily increases, to the point where the final chapter consists largely of material from Pinel's *Nosographie philosophique* (1798) setting out a classification of neuroses which, according to Postel, is little more than a plagiarization of Cullen's work on the same subject.

Here the book ends rather abruptly. There is no conclusion to tie together the threads of the various commentaries or to connect this derivative classification of 1798 with the truly original one Pinel advanced in 1801 in his *Traité médico-philosophique*. The Pinel we are left with is a figure of mediocre intellect, fortunate in having friends in high places after Thermidor and willing to advance his career by engaging in a certain amount of political opportunism. While this portrait may well be accurate, and (together with Othmar Keel's recent debunking of Pinel's originality in the conception of histopathology) may serve to counterbalance the heroic Pinel of medical myth, it nevertheless leaves obscure the nature and causes of Pinel's celebrity in his own day. What is called for now is a critical appraisal of Pinel's many accomplishments – one that is animated not by hagiographic or iconoclastic urges but by an impulse for genuine historical understanding.

W. R. Albury

School of History and Philosophy of Science
University of New South Wales

ROBERT CASTEL, FRANCOISE CASTEL, and ANNE LOVELL, *The psychiatric society*, trans. by A. Goldhammer, New York, and Guildford, Surrey, Columbia University Press, 1982, 8vo, pp. xxiii, 358, \$32.40.

Working within approaches familiar to Anglo-Saxon readers via the *savoir/pouvoir* analyses of Foucault and the “police your own family” interpretations of Donzelot, the authors of this powerfully-written and elegantly-translated Jeremiad probe the psychiatrization of modern man, taking the United States as the most pathological case. From the mid-nineteenth century, psychiatrization grew in America like a cancer. In 1860, only 8,500 people were locked away in asylums; by 1955, 558,000 were. The psychiatric gaze successively put whole new sectors of society under the microscope. Early in this century came the psychiatrization of alcoholics, drug-addicts, and degenerates; between the wars came the psychiatrization of childhood; since the Kennedy era, it has been the psychiatrization of social work, of women, homosexuals, and ethnic minorities. Once psychiatry was individual and recuperative; increasingly it takes the form of group preventive surveillance. Once it was only for society's failures; now it is for the normal as well (in Arthur Burton's words, “psychotherapy is no longer for the diseased . . . it is freedom's approach to growth”).

Psychiatry has advanced almost unresisted because it is a wolf in sheep's clothing. Indeed, it has been able to wear a more and more liberal face. In particular, the campaign of massive deinstitutionalization from the 1950s, purporting to reintegrate the disturbed into the community, mirrored the great Pinelian gesture of liberating the insane. It has also worn a humane face, especially during the 1970s' phase of free clinics and community programmes, staffed by volunteer non-professionals, sympathetic to the values of the counter-culture. And it has marched under the banner of personal liberation. Above all, the new West Coast psychotherapies, such as EST, have trumpeted human potential and personal growth (in Anthony Clare's phrase, “now let's talk about *me*”). Do not be hoodwinked, however, warn the authors. American psychiatry, whatever its roots and well-intentioned idealisms, is irredeemably suborned and co-opted by the powerful for the purposes of social repression (even alternatives to psychiatry mutate into the psychiatrization of the alternatives). All American psychiatry is ultimately geared to adjusting citizens to lifestyles of efficiency, profitability, and conformity.

This vision of the penetration of psychiatric power is pessimistic. But the half-truths are as plausible as they are paranoid, even in their heads-I-win-tails-you-lose aspects (thus, it is argued, institutionalization was an evil, because American asylums were brutal; but deinstitutionalization has proved equally an evil, because it has been merely a vote-catching gimmick, cheese-paring on cash and care, courtesy of Thorazine; and, anyway, the community

Book Reviews

is also brutalizing). The book's crucial defect, however, is that it nowhere offers a self-critical and rigorous analysis explaining why the psychiatrization of society has occurred. Is the cancer inherent in psychiatry itself, the ultimate intrusion? (The authors don't come clean as to how far they accept the Szaszian view that mental illness is a myth.) Or does the evil lie in its Circean promise to make the American Dream come true, the myth of personal optimization, where each man is an island, intire of himself? Or does it lie in the logic of modernization or capitalism, the requirement of soft-sell, victim-blaming social control? Or in an imperialist conspiracy amongst the "psy" professionals, championing consumers' rights to ever more treatment, monopolizing the soul sector? "Anti-psychiatrists" such as the authors of this book do not apparently think our doom of psychiatrization so inevitable that it is not worth challenging it (*vide* the chapter heading, 'A Resistible Rise'). But if they want to change it, or even devise a non-invasive, non-suborning psychiatry (as for instance Laing and Sedgwick have called for), it is up to them first to understand it.

Roy Porter
Wellcome Institute

J. M. TANNER, *A history of the study of human growth*, Cambridge University Press, 1981, 8vo, pp. xi, 499, £30.00.

It is hard to visualize anyone better equipped to write a history of the study of human growth than James Mourilyan Tanner. His own contribution to the field of human auxology has been so outstanding and his influence so widespread that it seems entirely natural to find a work of great authority and scholarship, tracing the study of growth from earliest references in Ancient Greek literature to the reports of the great national growth surveys of the present day, emanating from his experienced hand.

As he explains in the preface, the purpose of the book is two-fold: first, to describe the studies of human growth that have been made and the climates of scientific and philosophical theory that gave rise to them; second, to chart the actual changes in growth and development of children which have taken place throughout recorded history. It is the skilful manner in which the author has combined these two aspects that gives this book such a broad appeal. There is no doubt that historians and human biologists will be equally satisfied with this work.

The volume is organized into fifteen chapters and contains a bibliography of over 1,300 references. There are also extensive and informative endnotes, some to give additional bibliographic or biographical details, others to elaborate on points of interest, often in a most amusing manner.

The first three chapters are remarkable in that they include a period of about sixteen hundred years (second to eighteenth centuries) during which growth was hardly investigated at all. Undaunted by the prospect of writing with so little hard data to hand, Professor Tanner incorporates the meagre references to physical growth, theories of growth, menarche, pubertal changes, health, and hygiene into a rich tapestry of biographical notes on the ancient, medieval, and renaissance writers. The splendid illustrations and immensely readable text (which is characteristic of the whole book) give a remarkable insight into the sanctity of the numbers which expressed the bodily proportions of the ideal human figure.

From this point the author leads the reader through the theories of growth promulgated by the Iatromathematical School to the first person ever to publish a proper table of growth measurements, C. F. Jampert (1754). This is one of the many "firsts" chronicled in this book, which make fascinating reading.

One of the many interesting themes to run through the text is the confusion over the changes in velocity of growth at adolescence and the failure to appreciate the so-called time-spreading effect of averaging cross-sectional data. Even Quetelet, who relied so much on growth data to develop the foundations of modern statistics, obliterated the adolescent spurt from his published tables of growth and confused many later workers.

The practice of measuring was stimulated by the need to assess the size of potential military recruits and to identify them in cases of desertion. It was not until the eighteenth century that