



CHICAGO JOURNALS



History
of
Science
Society

Mei Zhan. Other-Worldly: Making Chinese Medicine through Transnational Frames.
Other-Worldly: Making Chinese Medicine through Transnational Frames by Mei Zhan
Review by: Angela Ki Che Leung
Isis, Vol. 103, No. 1 (March 2012), pp. 215-216
Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#) on behalf of [The History of Science Society](#)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/666453>
Accessed: 28/04/2012 09:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press and The History of Science Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Isis.

<http://www.jstor.org>

work on the craniometry of Samuel George Morton stirred sufficient interest to warrant an article in the *New York Times* and a significant amount of heated exchange on the Web. In 2009 David Prindle (a professor of government at the University of Texas, Austin) published the contentious if not particularly well informed *Stephen Jay Gould and the Politics of Evolution* (Prometheus) (see David Sepkoski's review in *Isis*, 2010, 101:455–456). And, of course, there have been many other treatments. Into this arena now come the Marxist materialist sociologists Richard York and Brett Clark. Their very readable and sympathetic portrait of Gould's work—both his evolutionary biology and his history of science—illuminates Gould's commitment to the humanist perspective and presents his most persistent overarching themes (the tempo of historical change, the structural underpinnings of order in nature, the contingent character of history, and the multilevel character of natural processes) in a clear and convincing fashion. The authors are explicit that their interest is in “the broader intellectual issues that underlie Gould's work, rather than [in] debating any single particular claim about natural history” (p. 12). Unfortunately, this leads to a rather superficial treatment of much of Gould's most significant work. It also contributes to some shorthand treatments of Gould's positions that obfuscate rather than clarify where he stood relative to Darwin's theory.

The book is divided in two parts. The first, “Evolutionary Theory and the History of Life,” concentrates on Gould's attempts to restructure contemporary evolutionary theory along more pluralist lines. Interestingly, this is one of the points that York and Clark muddle a bit. The authors repeatedly mention Gould's challenge to the modern synthesis, which is fair enough. What they miss, however, is that for Gould this was not a challenge to Darwin's initially broad and pluralistic approach. Rather, Gould was responding to the influence of reductionism and population genetics on the part of the architects of the synthesis (particularly Ernst Mayr, T. D. Dobzhansky, and G. G. Simpson). Gould most often saw his work as being more consistent with Darwin's originally broad formulation of the evolutionary process.

The second part of the volume, “Science and Humanity,” focuses largely on Gould's campaign against biological determinism. Here the authors to do a very nice job in outlining Gould's consistent critique of simple biological “explanations” of complex human behaviors and social norms (most clearly presented in his 1981 book *The Mismeasure of Man* [Norton])

and his ongoing critique of sociobiology and evolutionary psychology. Unfortunately, here again the authors' grand scope leads to some rather superficial analysis. *Mismeasure* was and is controversial (this is the source of Gould's analysis of Morton, mentioned in the first paragraph). These may be minor quibbles. Fans of Gould will love *The Science and Humanism of Stephen Jay Gould*; critics will dismiss it as overly sympathetic. Readers of *Isis* who are unfamiliar with Gould and the issues in twentieth-century evolutionary biology will benefit from this book. For historians of biology it offers a nice overview of Gould's work and his humanistic worldview but limited detail as to their sources and implications.

MARK E. BORRELLO

Mei Zhan. *Other-Worldly: Making Chinese Medicine through Transnational Frames*. xiv + 240 pp., illus., bibl., index. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2009. \$79.95 (cloth); \$22.95 (paper).

Other-Worldly eloquently shows the elusiveness of the “essence” or “authenticity” of traditional Chinese medicine (TCM), which practitioners and patients in and outside of China try to grapple with. In tackling TCM's globalization, knowledge production, and the politics of difference involved, Mei Zhan convincingly demonstrates the fluidity of TCM as a body of knowledge and a system of practice.

Zhan portrays TCM in translocal movements: as it is practiced and taught in Shanghai, the San Francisco area, and Africa. She analyzes its globalization in three historical periods: in the first forty years of the twentieth century, when Chinese medicine encountered new “scientific” biomedicine; in the 1960s and 1970s, when the People's Republic of China exported a scientized TCM to the Third World, notably Africa; and after the 1980s, when TCM refocused in Europe and North America as an alternative medicine for the urban white middle class. Zhan organizes the discussion of these spatiotemporalities in three parts. The first part of the book, which she calls “Entanglements,” focuses on the place of TCM after the 1980s in northern California, where the practice, now seen as “preventive medicine,” became identified with a Californian middle-class lifestyle. The second point stressed in this part of the book is the commodification of TCM in a global market economy as a medical practice of kindness, highlighting humane doctor–patient relations absent in biomedical practice and bringing in new actors and

opportunities. Part 2, entitled “Negotiations,” is about knowledge production in TCM in terms of its marginal position in relation to biomedicine, both in Shanghai and in California. Knowledges are created through negotiations with biomedicine, including translations of disease categories and body functions. Part 3, called “Dislocations,” is about gender relations in TCM knowledge transmission and how science, modernity, and tradition are translated through gendered kinship practices. Zhan has built her data on extensive fieldwork in hospitals and clinics of TCM in Shanghai and the Bay Area in the mid to late 1990s.

Drawing on the globalization theory of cultural anthropologists such as Anna Tsing and on Bruno Latour’s philosophy of science, Zhan deals with several key issues in the knowledge production and practice of TCM: the perennial concern on the part of its promoters, including the Chinese State, about its “status” as a “science,” which continues to affect its uneasy interaction with biomedicine; the debate, in different sites, over TCM’s “authenticity” as essentially acupuncture or herbal medicine; and the identity politics involved in the construction and practice of TCM, such as the representation of its “Chinese-ness” and the changing class, gender, and race of its practitioners and clientele, again in different sites. Zhan asks key questions that do not necessarily have standard and ready answers—for example, Why is TCM flourishing in California, while its appeal continues to diminish, especially for practitioners, back in Shanghai, where it has actually become part of institutionalized medicine?

This book is a fine and useful anthropological analysis of the present situation of TCM as practiced in China and California, with very interesting details on the changing discourses and practices of certain specialties—such as *waike* (external medicine), understood today as something comparable to biomedical surgery. Zhan combines her field observations and textual analyses with sophistication, and she writes with ease and eloquence. The book can be read together with earlier works by Judith Farquhar (*Knowing Practice: The Clinical Encounter of Chinese Medicine* [Westview, 1994]) and Volker Scheid (*Chinese Medicine in Contemporary China: Plurality and Synthesis* [Duke, 2002]). On the other hand, the discussions of the marginalization of TCM by biomedicine and of changing gendered kinship in its practice and knowledge production could be further enriched were they considered in more historical depth. Readers will wonder whether the marginalization of TCM today is significantly different from

what took place in the earlier historical moments (1910s and 1920s, 1950s and 1960s) mentioned by the author. The changing gendered relations in medical lineages, marked especially by the increasingly assertive role of daughters in practice and knowledge production, should also be analyzed as a continuing process that was already under way in the late imperial period.

This thoughtful book can be recommended to all students of history and anthropology of Chinese medicine and will also be enjoyed by non-specialists.

ANGELA KI CHE LEUNG

■ Sociology and Philosophy of Science

Michel Armatte. *La science économique comme ingénierie: Quantification et modélisation.* 354 pp., bibl., index. Paris: Presses des Mines, 2010. €29 (paper).

This collection of articles by Michel Armatte is a tribute to the interest and sophistication of new work on history of economic sciences. Not so long ago, the field was almost uniquely focused on economic thought and methodology and work was written mainly for the edification of economists, who meanwhile take an ever-diminishing interest in the past. It has in the past decade or two become an engaged and highly creative area of research. The decisive turn was from a preoccupation with theory, treated as an autonomous domain, to the scrutiny of locations and practices. Of the latter, the most conspicuous for economics are named in Armatte’s subtitle: quantification and modeling. When taken seriously, these lead ineluctably to a wider range of sites of knowledge such as government agencies, international organizations, think tanks, and financial institutions. Technical economic knowledge no longer appears as a domain of freedom from politics, but as the obverse of politics, subject to relentless processes of adaptation and forced differentiation.

Armatte opens *La science économique comme ingénierie* with some observations on a recent movement of critique by French graduate students of the “autism” of economic science in the internationalized Anglophone mode. The complaint, to which he ascribes some validity, is that economics has detached itself from the social world. The theoretical introduction to the field encountered by students, which also is strongly impressed on the minds and souls of professional economists, puts great stress on the abstractions of mathematized theory. Yet economics in practice must be understood as a set