cultures, some spread gradually, and a few have been almost completely expropriated by Europeans.

The great virtue of this book is that both mundane and exotic substances are discussed without ethnocentricity or moral posturing. The combination of detailed context and wide scope should prove thought-provoking to historians, anthropologists, and even medico-moral campaigners, suggesting connections and comparisons across time and space. It is by the exploration of differences and similarities, between the Amerindian use of coca and the English use of tea, for example, that both can be better understood.

David Harley,
University of Central Lancashire

Ann Oakley and **A Susan Williams** (eds), *The politics of the welfare state*, London, UCL Press, 1994, pp. viii, 232, illus., £35.00 (hardback 1–85728–205–1), £12.95 (paperback 1–85728–206–X).

This volume originated as a series of seminars held at the Social Science Research Unit of the Institute of Education of the University of London, described by Ann Oakley in her introduction as engaging in "policy-relevant work in the fields of health, education, and welfare". The seminars were intended to "promote an open debate of some of the key issues" confronting the staff of the unit in this work. The nine papers address a number of topics concerning the welfare state as it has evolved in Britain, both historical and more recent, in the light of current changes within the system.

The first three papers look at the roots of both the welfare state itself and its current predicament. Sheila Rowbotham analyses the ideas about "welfare" which arose in the late nineteenth century and associated debates over the role of the state. After a rather startling chronological leap, the story is taken up by Rodney Lowe in 'The rise and fall of the classic welfare state in Britain, 1945–76'.

Lowe suggests that, despite its considerable achievements, managerial and political problems present from its inception, if they did not actually undermine it, left the welfare state very vulnerable to determined attack. Charles Webster debunks the popular notion of a golden age of consensus in which the welfare state was detached from the petty machinations of party politics.

These papers establish a background of roads not taken, opportunities lost, dragons-teeth of discord planted, for the studies of various aspects of the present functioning of the embattled welfare state. Although local opinions are sought, as we see in Jennie Popay and Gareth Williams's chapter, this consumer-orientated approach seems more akin to marketing or public relations than to the kind of democratic, community-driven, local initiative described by Rowbotham, and does not necessarily adequately represent lay perceptions about health needs. Chris Ham, Frank Honigsbaum and David Thompson in their study of 'Priority setting for health gain' make the point that results produced by going out and "consulting" the public are contingent upon both the topics upon which questions are asked and their actual wording.

Nick Black and Elizabeth Thompson look at the problems in instituting effective medical audit practices and their relationship to the more general working environment. In a context of reduced resources doctors, cynical about the real role of audit, may focus on administrative rather than clinical issues. Jane Lewis's essay considers 'Choice, needs and enabling: the new community care' and indicates some of the unanalysed assumptions, and confusions of definition, which lie at the root of this controversial concept, and the problems which arise in its implementation.

Similar issues to those which are discussed in relation to health and welfare appear in 'Making sense of the new politics of education' by Geoff Whitty, Sharon Gewirtz and Tony Edwards, for example the potentially liberatory challenges of a plurality of interests which cannot be defined along traditional class lines. That new solutions may simply

259

perpetuate old inequalities in modern dress, rather than bring about "positive diversity", is a reiterated theme of these articles. Another common theme is the inherently problematic nature of a mercantile model invoking "competition" and "customers". The vexed issue of knowledge creation surfaces again in Mel Bartley's investigation of the relationship between research and policy in the case of the unemployment and health debate. Even when research is deemed desirable, what shapes the questions asked, and ignores others? All these essays are stimulating and provocative, and the authors do not shy away from exploring ambiguities in their evaluations of the losses and gains produced by change.

Lesley A Hall, Wellcome Institute

David E Leary (ed.), *Metaphors in the history of psychology*, Cambridge Studies in the History of Psychology, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. xiii, 383, £37.50, $69.95 (hardback 0–521–37166–X); £12.95, $17.95 (paperback 0–521–42152–7).

Over the last twenty years, the subjects of metaphor and language have provided the grounds for an increasing rapprochement between practitioners and historians of psychology. This volume is a testimony to that rapprochement. Drawing together essays from prominent psychologists such as Karl Pribram and Jerome Bruner and respected historians like Karl Danziger and David Leary, the volume promises to "raise the consciousness" of its readers "regarding the uses—and abuses—of metaphor in the history of psychology". In this respect, at least, the work is largely successful.

The authors, "with eyes peeled for metaphor" (to use Bruner and Feldman's distressing phrase), assiduously catalogue examples of analogy across two thousand years of psychology and its philosophical and political precursors. There is some overlap in the subject matter of the contributions. Whilst Paul McReynolds and Theodore Sarbin explore the metaphors which have been employed in the characterization of both desired and uncontrolled motivation, James Averill takes just one source of motive, emotion, and demonstrates how this itself can be divided into at least six categories: ranging from inner feelings through to social roles. This concern with the social bases of pŝychology and selfhood informs Kenneth Gergen's essay, as he traces the various images which have been used to symbolize society.

The remaining essays concentrate on metaphors of consciousness and cognition. Bruner and Feldman contrast the passive metaphors of consciousness which populated the associative tradition with the creative or active model of cognition proposed by Charles Sanders Peirce. Likewise, Karl Danziger focuses on theories of psychological association, showing how the looseness of this metaphor has allowed various authors to construct an imperializing cannon which encompassed authors as diverse as Aristotle and Hume. Karl Pribram's essay and the co-authored contribution by Robert Hoffman, Edward Cochran and James Nead chart the deployment of images from computer processing and telecommunications in current models of the brain. These last two essays invoke a weird teleology, in which technological innovation is seen as providing a greater and greater approximation to the inner nature of the human mind.

The problem with most of these essays is that they all too often degenerate into simple lists of metaphors occurring within the different specialisms of psychology. There is no theoretical perspective or critique informing the volume as a whole, as Leary says, "No contributor had to sign an oath of allegiance." It might have been better if they had. Whilst many of the authors celebrate the role of metaphor as a heuristic device, only Danziger explores the connection which metaphor posits between scientific language and the social world. This could, in the spirit of the work, be attributed to the role of metaphor itself. Metaphor, we are told, "motivates" or "generates" further research. Such phrases