CrossMark



detailed in the book are small acts: symbolic resistance such as the wearing of red, white, and blue (22–27), listening to the BBC on a crystal radio set (87), and petty thefts or acts of vandalism (216–18). Despite being seemingly minor acts, the consequences for such actions could be as severe as those experienced by their more celebrated continental counterparts: that Louisa Gould, caught sheltering a Russian slave worker (194–96), and James Houillebeq, arrested with a German pistol in May 1944 (218–19), both died in Nazi custody in 1945 demonstrates the seriousness of this kind of resistance in the eyes of the occupier.

The book appears to be a labor of love for the three historians involved, each contributing chapters suited to their particular academic strengths. Carr's chapters on material culture and memory, Sanders' chapters on governmental and economic resistance, and Willmot's chapters on humanitarian and women's resistance coalesce nicely into a comprehensive exploration. Although each has a particular writing style, both the materials and the authors' approach to them fit together extremely well. Carr, Sanders, and Willmot each use the terms "protest," "defiance," and "resistance" independently, but admit that many of the acts overlap. The V-sign campaign, for example, through which Islanders demonstrated against occupation by either wearing V signs or daubing walls and signs with the symbol, can be considered an act of protest and an act of defiance depending on the stage of the occupation at which it occurred.

The book was written to fill a gap within the existing historiography, and for that reason its thematic approach will appeal more to an academic audience than to general readership. The need to condense differing acts of resistance into themes also resulted in a lot of overlap. The names and acts pertaining to the more well-known resisters, for example, appear in multiple chapters, and the authors are cognizant that this is the case (14).

Details of many of these acts of resistance also appear elsewhere (including in Carr and Sanders' other publications), which means that for those already familiar with Channel Island Occupation history some of the book will seem to cover well-trodden ground. The compilation of these stories into one volume, however, is indeed unique, and the publication of this book is both necessary and timely.

*Protest, Defiance, and Resistance in the Channel Islands* will undoubtedly appeal to academics with an interest in occupation history, Holocaust studies, and resistance studies, and would be a good choice for anyone with a particular interest in the history of the Channel Islands or Island studies in general. However, the appeal could be much broader. Over the past two decades, there has been a noticeable appreciation of the need to bring to light tangential "British" narratives of the Second World War. As Britons increasingly seek to nuance their understanding of Britain's World War II experience, moving away from the hegemonic "finest hour" narrative so dominant in popular conception over the last seventy years, the image of British subjects participating in acts of nonmilitary resistance against their Nazi occupiers is a striking one. *Protest, Defiance, and Resistance* does not simply fill in a gap in Channel Island or occupation historiography; it contributes to a more balanced and nuanced understanding of the multiple "British" experiences of the Second World War.

*Daniel Travers,* Laurentian University

STEPHEN CASPER. *The Neurologists: A History of a Medical Specialty in Modern Britain, c. 1789–2000.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015. Pp. 288. £70.00 (paper).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.154

Some years ago, while writing a book about neurological influences on Victorian literature, I had trouble pinpointing the status of neurology as a discipline in nineteenth-century Britain.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2016.154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Many physicians described retroactively as neurologists by historians, for instance, were known in their own time by different titles (as psychologists, physiologists, anatomists, and general practitioners) and for achievements in various subfields. Take, for example, Sir William Thornley Stoker (1845–1912), an accomplished neurosurgeon who not only performed some of the first brain surgeries in Ireland using David Ferrier's cortical maps but also published articles on hysterectomy, appendectomy, and bowel obstruction, among other topics. Stoker was also known for his political activism as an opponent of certain types of vivisection, and for his famous younger brother, Bram, the author of *Dracula* (1897). For the breadth of his interests, a twenty-first century interpreter might be tempted to classify Stoker as a general practitioner, despite his status as the leading neurological specialist in Ireland at the time.

If Stephen Casper's *The Neurologists: A History of a Medical Specialty in Modern Britain* had been available at the time I was writing, I would have gained a much clearer understanding of the historical development of neurology as a discipline, as well as how the field's retroactive construction by modern-day neurologists had added to my confusion. Casper's clearly written, painstakingly researched volume describes the rapid rise of neurology as a specialty in Britain between 1789 and 2000, along with the challenges and controversies that accompanied this increased specialization. Unlike most histories of neurology, Casper's depicts a discipline in flux, one whose boundaries were not clearly delineated in the nineteenth century and remain indistinct even now. While Casper glosses the leading neurological discoveries of this period, culminating in the modern era of neuroimaging and neuropharmacology, he is more interested in the people and the politics behind the formation of the discipline. By highlighting the disagreements between neurologists themselves, as well as cooperative forums in which they organized for political change, he paints a unique picture of the struggle towards medical specialization in this field, and the consequences (both positive and negative) of the discipline's increasing specificity.

Casper's opening chapters address the neurological achievements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the generalist medical culture from which they arose. His introduction is an especially valuable resource. It covers nineteenth-century neuroscience in a concise and highly readable format and assumes no prior knowledge of the subject. I would gladly recommend this introduction to students or general readers seeking a succinct, clear overview of this eventful period in British medicine.

In the first and second chapters, Casper describes in greater detail the decades leading up to the First World War, focusing on neurological societies formed by members of this emergent profession. Having access to the minutes of these societies and private letters between members, Casper paints a richly textured picture of the day-to-day activities of these groups, especially the London-based Neurological Society. This group was founded by John Hughlings Jackson and other medical luminaries in 1886 and restructured as a branch of the Royal Society of Medicine in 1907. During this period, the word "neurologist," coined by Thomas Willis in 1664, was still in very limited circulation, and most physicians were loath to conceive of themselves in such specialist terms (4). Instead, Victorian physicians cultivated the image of the gentleman scholar or Renaissance man. Accordingly, the Neurological Society welcomed members with varied medical backgrounds, including clinicians, researchers, and philosophers. In calling such people "neurologists," Casper suggests, historians of neurology (many of whom are also practicing neurologists) have attempted to reify the status of their discipline by suggesting its timelessness and stability, thus belying the field's relative newness and ongoing evolution (162–63).

How did British neurology evolve from a loose coalition of gentleman scholars to the highly influential, established medical specialty it is today? Casper addresses this question in the remaining chapters, describing how two world wars and the creation of the National Health Services in the 1940s motivated the field's increasing specialization. So, too, did the Association of British Neurologists, founded in 1932 in response to an internal scandal

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2016.154 Published online by Cambridge University Press

within the field. The association not only established codes of conduct for its members, but also petitioned for greater governmental recognition of their medical specialty. In the 1950s, for instance, members successfully lobbied the National Health Services to employ greater numbers of neurologists at clinics and research centers throughout Britain, reversing what was widely perceived as a decline in the status of neurology at mid-century. In fact, the interwar period and the decades immediately following proved crucial in establishing Britain's international preeminence in neurology. This period also witnessed major growth in external funding available for neurological researchers—both clinicians and basic scientists—from groups like the Medical Research Council and the Rockefeller Foundation. By the 1970s, Casper explains, neurology was firmly ensconced within the national and international medical establishment. It was also widely seen as a prestigious field with special relevance for its cultural moment. When US President George H. W. Bush declared the 1990s the "Decade of the Brain," he made official what many had long felt—that "neuroculture" now frames popular self-understanding (177). In Casper's words, "selfhood and brainhood" have "collapsed together" (27).

Refreshingly, Casper does not assume that specialization is an inevitable or even desirable phenomenon, nor does he unquestioningly accept the mechanistic understandings of selfhood introduced by neuroscience. In his thought-provoking conclusion, Casper ponders all of these issues evenhandedly. He also describes how neurology's early history of generalism has made it easier for the discipline to tackle major philosophical questions in the present day. Overall, Casper's highly readable book is a welcome corrective to the self-aggrandizing tendency evident in many histories of neurology. By showing us the people behind the development of modern neurology not as "great men" of science, but as multifaceted human beings and effective political actors, he provides new insight into the formation of the field.

*Anne Stiles,* Saint Louis University

DAVID CESARANI. *Disraeli: The Novel Politician*. Yale Jewish Lives. London: Yale University Press, 2016. Pp. viii + 292. $25.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.155

The defining subject of David Cesarani's posthumous *Disraeli*, commissioned by Yale University Press for its Jewish Lives series, is Disraeli's Jewishness, a much-trodden field. Cesarani begins by asking, "Does Benjamin Disraeli deserve a place in a series of books called Jewish Lives?"(1). The reader must wait until near midpoint in the book for a clear statement of that central issue: Disraeli needed—as do his biographers—a "solution to his dual identity as a Jew and a Christian" (259). Cesarani is at pains to scale back the excessive Jewishness with which Disraeli has been endowed by biographers and historians, itself a response to the non-Jewish Disraeli that had prevailed in earlier decades.

Cesarani argues that Disraeli's words or actions identifying him with Jews or Judaism were late, ignorant, intermittent, and superficial. In making the case, his text sometimes reads more like a prosecuting attorney's brief than a historical inquiry; he also depends on the argument from silence or ignores evidence. For instance, Disraeli wrote from Spain of Washington Irving, his father's friend and author of *The Conquest of Granada*, which he is avidly reading and recommends to his father because "I am wandering among [its] scenes"; Disraeli could not have missed those paragraphs that portray the forced conversion of the Spanish Jews and persecution of the "pseudo-Christians" (crypto-Jews), yet Cesarani questions whether "he was aware of [Granada's Jewish past] at all" (45). Moreover, the fact that Disraeli did not actually write his sister the several pages that "I could write" on his sojourn in Jerusalem, "the most delightful of all our travels," is invoked as evidence of indifference (48). On a similar

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2016.154 Published online by Cambridge University Press