

reservations notwithstanding, Bala's study is undoubtedly a pioneering work and deserves a warm welcome. The "oligopoly" model, when refined to take the class and gender of patient populations into account, should find wide application in colonial contexts other than that of Bengal.

Chandak Sengoopta
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

Sheldon Gardner and Gwendolyn Stevens. *Red Vienna and the Golden Age of Psychology, 1918–1938*. New York: Praeger, 1992. xiv + 285 pp. \$49.95.

The history of psychology is in a sorry state. Historians of science have generally neglected this field in favor of the "hard" sciences. Some notable exceptions exist, but these are few and far between. The history of psychology continues to be written mainly by psychologists. This brings with it certain problems. The history of psychology is not generally regarded as a legitimate area of specialization within psychology. Most psychologists who pursue the history of their discipline are forced to do so as a part-time "hobby." This is reflected in the quality of much of the work that is produced.

These remarks should serve to introduce what follows. I was extremely disappointed with this book. It contains very little that is new or original. The authors mention in the preface that they conducted more than one hundred interviews. These are said to "provide a major source of the material for this book" (p. xi). With the exception of a few footnotes, however, I could find no information that was derived from these interviews. The authors also mention that they found it necessary to "dip into the archives at the university" (p. xii). I could find no information that was based on archival material (from the university or anywhere else). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the book is based almost entirely on secondary sources.

This problem is not helped by the fact that a highly selective—and largely outdated—sample of the secondary literature has been used. A major source of information is Boring's *History of Experimental Psychology* (1950). This is cited as an authority throughout the book. Thus Wundt's "structuralism" is said to have been faithfully represented by E. B. Titchener. There was a great deal of scholarly work in the 1970s and 1980s which overturned this view, but the authors seem to be completely unaware of its existence. This is merely one example of the many inaccuracies that can be found in the book. Some of these can be attributed to unreliable secondary sources. Others can be attributed to errors the authors have made while copying from the secondary literature.

The authors end the book with a chapter entitled "The Ivory Tower in Never-Never Land" (pp. 239–53). Given that they are clinical psychologists working outside university settings, it will be clear that they have an "internalist" axe to grind. Historians of psychology are faulted for failing to relate psychology to its social and political context. This is because "most historians are male experimen-

tal psychologists" (p. 245). I was puzzled by this remark until I remembered that the authors still regard Boring's textbook as the definitive account. There is a large body of literature—much of it written by professional historians—that does relate psychology to its social and political context. Some of this literature is directly relevant to the topic at hand. The excellent work of Mitchell Ash on the Vienna Psychological Institute between 1922 and 1942 is mentioned nowhere at all in the book. The authors display an astonishing ignorance of the modern literature on the history of psychology.

Red Vienna and the Golden Age of Psychology is the work of "hobby-historians" whose view of the history of psychology is based mainly on textbooks. These seem to have provided an implicit model for the work. Thus much of the information is presented in the form of thumbnail biographical sketches. The authors refer to "the current renewed interest in psychology's past which has led to greater professionalization" (p. 239). This book can be seen as evidence that an even greater professionalization is needed. It is to be hoped that the day will come when psychologists realize that there is more to writing history than reading a few secondary sources and then building a story around them.

Adrian Brock
York University

Peter Heller. *Anna Freud's Letters to Eva Rosenfeld*. Translated by Mary Weigand, with contributions by Günther Bittner and Victor Ross. Madison, Conn.: International Universities Press, 1992. xiii + 210 pp. Ill. \$30.00.

Anna Freud ended up as her father's leading disciple. By the time of her death in 1982, no one was able to challenge the extent to which she had come to symbolize the profession of psychoanalysis. She had not only continued to live in the house Freud died in—which has now become the Freud Museum, in Hampstead, England—but she exercised special power by virtue of her control over Freud's literary remains.

Anyone from the world of scholarship had to feel intimidated in "Miss Freud's" presence. Yet early photographs of her from before she entered her father's world as a clinical practitioner, and even at the time of her first seeing patients in the early 1920s, show a more vulnerable and shy woman than the one she later displayed to the outside world. Once Sigmund Freud fell ill with cancer of the jaw in 1923, his youngest child, Anna, had all sorts of new responsibilities thrust upon her. Under the burden of statecraft she changed, growing into a formidable force.

These letters of Anna Freud's record a private side of her which I had beforehand only heard about from others, and to which I was never able myself to bear witness. She is here writing to her intimate friend Eva Rosenfeld. The most passionate part of Anna Freud's attachment to Rosenfeld took place before the time Dorothy Burlingham had supplanted the latter as the former's closest friend.