and human, past and presence grow entangled. This section is a fascinating example of how two realms—ghost and human, Yin and Yang, the contemporary cosmology and the history — intersect to haunting effect.

Chapter four turns to the theme of madness. In this chapter, Ng examines the weakening intergenerational ties and the crisis of filial piety in the rural area and its devastating effects on struggling peasants. Those mentally afflicted eventually wind up in the psychiatric wards, where they find a space of fleeting respite. Departing from the tendency toward biological reductionism among psychiatric hospitals in urban China, Ng intrigues the readers by illustrating distinctive psychiatric logic and practices in Hexian country hospital. While the psychiatrists in Hexian share the western psychiatric diagnosis and cures, they and their patients consider hospitalization itself a form of healing by extrication from the unbearable entanglements of shifting familial tensions and strains of declining agricultural life. The psychiatrists greet patients to "come to take a rest here" (105) while prescribing daily psychopharmaceutical prescriptions for them. Ng's keen observations on the seemingly paradoxical practice in Hexian psychiatric wards complicate our understanding of the tension between the western psychiatric hegemony movement and the local moral world.

In the last chapter, through a case study of a spirit medium diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder intimately related to culture, Ng critically develops the concept of "mutual diagnosis" to approach the contemporary and historical crossovers between psychiatry and mediumship. That is, when psychiatric discourse categorizes mediumship and spirit possession as a culture-bound and culture-related psychiatric disorder, proclaiming the ontological illegitimacy of superstition, spirit medium, in turn, take up psychiatric discourse to offer a different diagnosis. For the spirit medium who "walks Mao's path" in the case, symptoms are not merely indications for psychiatric afflictions but signs of cosmopolitical disarray in the post-Mao world. Only through completing the unfinished revolutionary path, reembracing Mao's divine sovereignty, can demonic ghosts and spirits be expelled, and psychiatric afflictions can be eliminated.

Throughout the book, Ng examines how the Maoist unfulfilled promises of peasant political subjectivity, along with the postreform economic poverty and symbolic dispossession, are "abbreviated and transfigured" (144) through and in possessed bodies and madness in rural China. Ng's sample size of spirit medium and peasants is small. Nevertheless, she uses the case study method to gather her material to get to know individuals and their relationships at a close and intimate level. Ng carefully listens to various subjects, such as spirit medium, peasants, psychiatrists, the mentally afflicted and their families, to speak and maps their voices onto the grander movement of historical changes and social transitions. These ethnographical findings are complemented by her proficient multi-textual analysis of the literature of history and political campaigns. Overall, Ng writes with an articulate style full of theoretical rumination and ethnographical nuance. This book deserves attention from all who wish better to understand Chinese modernity and rural China in postsocialist era.

Linying Hu
Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada
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CORNERSTONES OF ATTACHMENT RESEARCH

Robbie Duschinsky


The general goal of psychoanalytic psychotherapy is to alleviate psychic tension that results from unconscious maladaptation in day-to-day life. To do so, psychotherapists help their patients by exploring intrapsychic and unconscious conflicts; identifying defense mechanisms that avoid unpleasant consequences of conflict; and by using
the dynamics of the client–therapist relationship in which life issues re-emerge (as transference and countertransference). Some forms of psychoanalytic therapy particularly promote the integration of the self (e.g., Heinz Kohut’s self-psychology), while other currents focus primarily on interpersonal or object relations (e.g., the work of Glenn Gabbard and Otto Kernberg). Similarly, in *Cornerstones of Attachment Research*, Robbie Duschinsky is able to make clear to the reader how attachment theory—an object-relations theory that has its roots in Freudian psychoanalysis—developed as a result of the interpersonal contacts between Bowlby, Ainsworth, and subsequent generations of attachment researchers and how different parts of “Bowlby’s self”—as a scientist, as a popularizer, and as a clinician—should be integrated. The result is a monumental work that is of great value for scientists in the field of attachment, clinicians working in child psychiatry, and for policymakers at all levels of governance. But how exactly does Duschinsky add to the historiography of attachment theory?

The outlines of John Bowlby’s attachment theory were originally formulated in the 1950s and further developed together with the American–Canadian psychologist Mary Ainsworth in the 1960s. After the initial formulation, the work of new generations of attachment researchers has turned attachment theory into a major theory in psychology. With the ascendance of such a grand theory, historians of science over time reflect on its development: “Work to document the emergence of Bowlby and Ainsworth’s research by academic historians began in the late 1990s and remains thriving today” (p. xi), more specifically on the psychoanalytic and etiological roots of attachment theory (Karen, 1994; Van der Horst, 2011; Van Dijken, 1998) and the specific contributions of Ainsworth and their origins in the work of Canadian psychologist William Blatz (Van Rosmalen et al., 2016, 2015). Duschinsky adds to this historiography by relating the contributions of attachment researchers of the second generation. He correctly states that “the important developments in the field of the past 30 years have not been examined by historians, a startling gap in light of the revolutions in theory and method that have taken place in these decades” (p. xi).

The first two chapters of *Cornerstones* deal with the “original” work of Bowlby and Ainsworth. Bowlby’s ideas developed as a result of his training in psychoanalysis and his subsequent introduction to ethology and evolutionary theory. The incompatibilities between psychoanalysis and ethology led to clear tension in his work. By presenting unpublished work from Bowlby’s personal papers, Duschinsky sheds new light on such tensions, for example, with regard to Bowlby’s idea of monotropy (“the tendency for instinctual responses to be directed towards a particular individual”; Bowlby, 1958, p. 370), for which he was later heavily criticized (e.g., Vicedo, 2013). The fact that Bowlby had the conviction that “in different roles, one is entitled to speak in different voices” certainly did not help to integrate his scientific, popular, and clinical ideas about attachment. In the next chapter, the contributions of Ainsworth are discussed, such as the concept of security (which she took from her mentor Blatz), the development of the Strange Situation Procedure, and the construction of the concept of “sensitivity.” These contributions were of much value to Bowlby’s theoretical ideas, as they were the start of attachment as an empirical research paradigm.

Whereas the first two chapters lean heavily on previous historical work done in the field, in the chapters that follow, Duschinsky adds much new impetus to the discourse on attachment theory, by exploring the work of the second generation of attachment researchers. Chapter three relates in detail Main and Hesse’s work on the classification of attachment disorganization in the Strange Situation and the development of the Adult Attachment Interview as a measure for adult attachment representations. This study was a crucial “move to the level of representation” and Main’s work was certainly as influential as that of Bowlby and Ainsworth. Subsequently, the work of Alan Sroufe and Byron Egeland and their longitudinal study of risk and adaptation in an at-risk population is discussed. Their research group added important ideas on resilience as a social and developmental concept, on “felt security” and on emotion regulation. The last chapter evaluates the work of Shaver and Mikulincer within the field of social psychology on individual differences in attachment and the development of the Experiences of Close Relationships scale, the most widely used self-report measure of adult attachment. From this chapter, it becomes clear how different traditions offer different interpretations of Bowlby’s and Ainsworth’s ideas.
Taken together the five chapters show how attachment theory was initially formulated by Bowlby at different levels: theoretical, practical, and clinical, and how Ainsworth’s contributions to the theory made it a research paradigm that the second generation helped to shape further. Cornerstones offers a critical analysis of how key concepts have been misinterpreted and how misunderstandings of core ideas in attachment theory have become so prominent in different areas (e.g., psychiatry, social psychology, child welfare, developmental science). By ending each of the first three chapters with an overview of key concepts and their common misinterpretations, Duschinsky gives ample opportunity for the integration of the “different voices” of attachment theory. Like a good therapist, Duschinsky enables his “patient” to reflect on his internal conflicts and tensions, and to integrate different parts of the self.

Although the length of the book may withhold readers outside the attachment community from taking in the vast amount of new insights, it is exactly the meticulous approach taken here that is one of the great achievements of Cornerstones. Duschinsky has not only studied the classic texts in attachment theory, but was in close contact with many of the attachment researchers involved, and has sifted through personal papers from the archives of Bowlby, Ainsworth, and Main and Hesse. This triangulation of sources—analysis of published and unpublished papers and books, personal communication, and archival research—is a tremendous achievement. In a blurb on the cover of Cornerstones, Alan Sroufe predicts that this book “will be the definitive work.” It is hard to say whether it will be, as Duschinsky writes about events and developments that are fairly recent. One of the major problems faced by contemporary historians is a lack of historical distance, so only time can tell how definitive Cornerstones will be. But without doubt, has Duschinsky succeeded in making a great leap forward in the historical description and analysis of “one of the last of the grand theories of human development that still retains an active research tradition” (p. vii).
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