“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


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
temper”. While one of the founding fathers of the Indian nation defined “Indianness” as opposed to modern science, the other embraced it in his attempt to bring the Indian nation into contact with the modern world. How the relation between science and nationalism was played out by a number of prominent Indian scientists and how difficult it was to reconcile an alleged Indian spirituality with modern science, form central and highly interesting themes in Chakrabarti’s book. The scope of the book is, however, much broader. Chakrabarti aims to investigate the position of science in the (colonial) relation between metropolis and periphery; how science was transmuted, redefined and perhaps dislocated as it travelled from one to the other and—as he rightly insists—often back again. This is not so much—as the subtitle would indicate—an analysis of colonial scientific practice, as of colonial perceptions of science.

Chapters two, three and four deal with science in nineteenth-century India. The first two chapters focus on the Asiatic Society and the first half of the century, the last on late-nineteenth-century India and the geologist Thomas Holland in particular. Chakrabarti takes issue with Deepak Kumar’s (and D R Headrick’s?) contention that scientific practice was basically an extension of economic imperialism. For the first part of the century Chakrabarti emphasizes the need to explore other links between science and imperialism and tends to portray early colonial scientists as insulated romantics pursuing a “tragic quest” for scientific truth. This point should, however, not be taken too far. Most scientists in nineteenth-century India were after all servants of the colonial state and could not have been all that insulated “from the logic of the politics and economics of the state” (p. 89). A study of nineteenth-century medicine—which is only touched upon lightly in the book—could have added a useful perspective to this issue. Despite a number of interesting observations in these chapters, the treatment of science in nineteenth-century India is too sporadic. It is possible to gather much information, but there is a lack of coherence. To this reviewer at least, the gap between the amateur scientists of the Asiatic Society and the relatively detailed discussion of Thomas Holland and late-nineteenth-century geology is simply too wide.

From chapter five onwards the issue of nationalism is introduced and this gives the last half of the book a coherence that is lacking in the first. Through analyses of individual scientists, Chakrabarti succeeds in illuminating the tensions between nationalism and science from the 1890s onwards. Mahendra Lal Sircar, the doctor, seems to have remained largely within orientalist stereotypes. He saw science as fundamentally alien to Indian culture and remained eternally grateful to the British for having brought it to India. Yet, he refused to give up Indian spirituality. The physicist Jagadish Chandra Bose first pursued an exceptional scientific career and became an icon for the nationalist movement. Then—in an attempt to link nationalism and science—his work took a metaphysical turn and Bose (perhaps sadly) “became what he was always expected to be, a sanyasi from the spiritual world of the East who brought the wisdom of that world to science” (p. 218). Prafulla Chandra Ray, the chemist, argued that India had a scientific tradition every bit as rational and materialist as the Greek but eventually came to accept orientalist notions about a “slumbering” Orient and a “vibrant” Occident. These analyses of the way in which these scientists struggled to reconcile Indian nationalism and modern science and to be both “Indian” and “modern” are highly recommendable, even if the rest of book does not quite reach the same standard.

Niels Brimnes, University of Aarhus


Eugene Umberger, in his chapter in this book on lady nicotine, points to a fifty-year explosion of publication on tobacco and smoking. There is a stream of tobacco literature and one can hardly imagine that there is room for much more.