

tion on tools rather than human actors in these stories. Nonetheless, the terrain traversed by Drucker in this accessible, informative book will fascinate readers, and it's a territory that certainly merits the attention she has given it.

Peter Hegarty

Peter Hegarty is Professor of Psychology at the University of Surrey. His research aims to integrate psychological science, gender and sexuality studies, and science and technology studies. His first book is Gentlemen's Disagreement: Alfred Kinsey, Lewis Terman, and the Sexual Politics of Smart Men (University of Chicago Press, 2013).

Roger E. Backhouse; Philippe Fontaine (Editors). *A Historiography of the Modern Social Sciences*. ix + 248 pp., tables, index. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. \$89.99 (cloth).

Writing a history of a scientific discipline more often than not serves a specific goal: legitimizing the discipline in question, glorifying its current state of affairs by comparison with its infancy, or criticizing the mainstream and introducing a new paradigm. The professionalization of science history in recent decades has curbed but not abolished these tendencies. Especially within the social science disciplines, history writing is a continuous struggle both to uphold scholarly standards and to serve a useful purpose in actual developments and debates within the discipline, as this collection of papers clearly exemplifies.

What exactly are the social sciences? Opinions differ. For instance, Immanuel Wallerstein *et alia*, in *Open the Social Sciences* (Stanford, 1996), designate history as one of the social sciences but exclude psychology, since its practice “came to be defined as lying not in the social arena but primarily in the medical arena” (p. 27). Psychologists therefore often sought (and seek) to “move beyond social science” to become a biological or behavioral science.

The book edited by Roger Backhouse and Philippe Fontaine discusses the post–World War II historiographical traditions and developments regarding five social sciences: anthropology, sociology, psychology, economics, and political science. Although they argue in their introduction for “a comparative interdisciplinary historiography” (p. 2), the book is firmly built on a disciplinary approach, because this “reflects the way the bulk of the literature has evolved.” Historians of the social sciences tend to be “well informed about their niche but show little awareness of historiographical developments within contexts other than their own” (p. 16).

Unfortunately, this also holds for most of the contributors to this book. Henrika Kuklick, for instance, presents the reader with a detailed account of styles of history writing (e.g., presentist versus historicist) in the various subfields of anthropology. She concludes that the history of anthropology has no equivalent of, for instance, Kurt Danziger's *Constructing the Subject* (Cambridge, 1990) for psychology. Although she makes no explicit comparison with other social science disciplines, she gives as a cause for this lack of achievement that “anthropology is more complex than any of the other social sciences” and that therefore “the history is arguably the most difficult to write” (p. 91).

Charles Camic, in his chapter on sociology, fed the expression “history of sociology” into JSTOR 1945–2012 and analyzed a random sample of 151 historical articles from three periods with regard to main topic, methodology, and relation to previous scholarship. His chief conclusion is that although the history of sociology has become professionalized during the postwar period, it has also become marginalized, as is witnessed by the lack of courses on the history of sociology in American sociology graduate programs.

James Capshew, on the other hand, chose to build his chapter on the historiography of psychology around major figures, publications, organizations, and events. This has resulted in a very readable and well-informed account of—mainly—North American scholarship on the discipline, but as in the earlier chapters it is limited to the discipline itself.

Although economics falls between C. P. Snow's two cultures just as much as the social sciences do, many economists reject the subordination of their discipline to the social sciences. Backhouse and Fontaine largely neglect this issue in their essay but focus instead on the troublesome relationship between economists and historians of economics, caused by the profound lack of interest among economists in the history of their own discipline.

Finally, Robert Adcock offers, as he calls it, "a disciplinary history of disciplinary histories of political science" (p. 212), in which he concludes that in the last decades there has been a significant globalizing trend in the history of political science. The chapter is well documented, but it is not likely to interest readers from outside the field. Although there are parallels with earlier chapters (the type of periodization, the professionalization of historiography, the difficult relationship with the "mother" discipline), an explicit comparison or a debate about differences and similarities in history writing between disciplines is lacking.

The interrelation between history and the social sciences is analyzed in the chapter on history and historiography by Kevin Passmore. The "swan song of political history," the "social turn," the "cultural turn," and the "transnational turn" figure as markers in a reconstruction of trends in history writing since World War II. In his conclusion Passmore argues "that the histories of the social sciences and history have been more entangled than some practitioners claim" (p. 54). This is a bit awkward, because his chapter also provides support for the existence of mutual hostility between representatives of the history and social science disciplines.

A Historiography of the Modern Social Sciences offers a useful overview of half a century of social science history, but I would have wished the book to be more thought provoking. For instance, it would have been worthwhile to analyze why disciplines that are so close to history as the social sciences have so much trouble taking historiography seriously. Also, it would be interesting to assess to what degree the social sciences themselves can benefit from adopting a historical perspective, as "critical realists" such as Peter T. Manicas (*A Realist Philosophy of Social Science* [Cambridge, 2006]) suggest. If it had taken up these questions, the book might have provided historians of the social sciences with more ammunition to defend and enhance their status.

Ruud Abma

Ruud Abma is Senior Lecturer in the History and Philosophy of the Social Sciences at Utrecht University. He contributed to Jeroen Jansz and Peter Van Drunen's edited volume A Social History of Psychology (2004) and has written several books and articles on the history of the social sciences.

Gerard Alberts; Ruth Oldenziel (Editors). *Hacking Europe: From Computing Cultures to Demoscenes*. (History of Computing.) viii + 269 pp., illus., tables, bibl., index. London: Springer, 2014. €90.09 (cloth).

Hacking Europe should pique the curiosity of anyone interested in Cold War technoscience. One simple reason is the state of historiography of the subject: while it is possible to find publications on some aspects of individual national computing histories—often in corresponding national languages—no single monograph before this one has addressed the history of computing in Europe in English. Both readers familiar with history of computing literature and those interested in modern Europe are guaranteed to find something unexpected here: from software transmissions in audio signals over Dutch radio in the 1970s, to UNESCO's involvement in the 1989 Galactic Hacker Party, to thousands of unregulated optical networking DIY devices glowing red over post-Communist Prague. Beyond the abundance of original material in each of the nine individual chapters, the contributions and an editorial piece in combination present a number of thought-provoking puzzles for a historian of modern science. With its pioneering subject matter, *Hacking Europe* offers more questions than answers.