occupational health related initiatives trailing back into the nineteenth century. What disrupted the development of occupational health severely in Germany, as it did to a lesser extent in other countries, was the Second World War. After which one may say from reading this volume that it is only then that occupational medicine fully comes into its own with the onset of capitalism's "long boom".

It is also interesting to note the way in which institutes and organizations dealing with occupational health interact with existing medical disciplines, schools, and establishments. In many cases, the relationship is an unequal one with occupational health appearing as the Cinderella subject. In many of the chapters we see the driving individuals who have pushed forward the boundaries of medicine into the workplace, but this is not a story of "great heroic men", for in most chapters they are nicely woven into the overall story. This volume also interestingly reveals the way in which the state places itself between labour and capital or in some cases sides with one vis-à-vis the other. All these issues are dealt with to varying degrees in the country studies. Although the task would have been difficult, it would have been nice to have seen a chapter drawing out comparisons and contradistinctions between all the countries. Some of the chapters are much richer in medical historical background than others, and it would have been better to have tried for a more even balance between them in this respect. Nevertheless, this volume is excellent in its breadth of coverage and wide sweep and, in conjunction with the companion volume *Contributions to the history of occupational and environmental prevention* also partially edited by Antonio Grieco and Sergio Iavicoli, makes excellent reading. The country comparative approach to medical history is too infrequent and the effort of Grieco and Iavicoli in bringing together so many different scholars from around the world is therefore to be highly commended.

Mark W Bufton,
Exeter University

Claude E Dolman and **Richard J Wolfe,** *Suppressing the diseases of animals and man: Theobald Smith, microbiologist*, London, Harvard University Press, 2003, pp. xii, 691, illus., £29.95 (hardback 0-674-01220-8).

Microbiologists of the second generation stand somewhat in the shade of the founding fathers. Pasteur and Koch might nearly be household names but "Theobald Smith—who?" may be a somewhat unkind cut but it catches the flavour of the difference in reputation of the two ages. This is not to say it is an accurate mirror of historical significance or scientific worth. Amongst bacteriologists, parasitologists and especially comparative pathologists Smith ranks as a gigantic figure. Historians, however, have given him relatively little attention.

Smith, the son of German emigrants called Schmitt (Theobald seems to have changed his name slowly around 1876), was born in Albany, New York in 1859. He was educated at Cornell and Albany Medical School from which he graduated in 1883. The young Smith had all the credentials on paper for a distinguished career. Academically gifted with a flair for science and a German speaker who entered research when Koch's bacteriology had become rampant, he did indeed make the most of nature and nurture. With the aid of the microscopist Simon H Gage he was appointed in 1883 to a position at the US Department of Agriculture. Here he worked in the Veterinary Division under Daniel Elmer Salmon. Within six months, Smith was made inspector of the recently established Bureau of Animal Husbandry. Salmon was made its Chief.

It is arguable that much of the success of Koch's bacteriology lay in the ways in which its techniques and technologies were easily exportable. Smith taught himself Koch's culture methods. He was soon recognized as a "pioneer American instructor" in bacteriology (p. 54). In these years he worked on hog cholera and swine plague. Salmon also worked on the former and problems of collaboration and priority smouldered between them, which are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300008759 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well catalogued here. When Smith is remembered outside the scientific disciplines in which he worked it is for his studies of Texas (Southern) cattle fever. Salmon also worked on this. Smith, however, it is (in the US) who is accorded the honour of discovering the protozoan parasite, Babesia, named after the Romanian Victor Babes, with whom priority questions also arose. Smith also described the role of ticks in the fever's transmission. After Washington, Smith gained (and declined) a number of illustrious positions. He was Professor of Comparative Pathology at Harvard and turned down the directorship of the Rockefeller Institute in 1901.

What makes Smith's academic career so interesting is that he lived through and contributed to bacteriology's "golden age", roughly 1880–1900. But then he did the same for the later period (he died in 1934) when bacteriologists began to doubt whether identification of seemingly immutable pathogenic agents was all there was to their subject. In the early twentieth century problems of host immunity began to be investigated. The soil, as it was said, was as important as the seed. The chemical constitution of bacteria also began to be investigated.

These and other shifts can be seen simply by scanning Smith's massive chronological bibliography, meticulously compiled here. This whole volume, with its impeccable footnoting, is a monument to thorough scholarship. It chronicles in detail not only Smith's scientific life but also his domestic one. Any criticism seems churlish but I was a little "Smithed out" by the detail at times. I could have become a tree expert without much knowledge of woods. Even deep in the arboretum, however, strange species suddenly appeared. On a trip to Britain, Smith recorded: "Englishmen! About half resemble Col. Hopkins [who?] and the rest are an indescribable mixture. The women seem to dress very dowdily" (p.163).

Christopher Lawrence,
The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL

Katherine Angel, Edgar Jones and **Michael Neve** (eds), *European psychiatry on the eve of war: Aubrey Lewis, the Maudsley Hospital and the Rockefeller Foundation in the 1930s*, Medical History, Supplement No 22, London, Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at University College London, 2003, pp. 195, illus, £32.00, US$50.00 (hardback 0-85484-092-3).

This book is a real treat, a rare opportunity to grasp the realities of psychiatry in Europe between the two world wars, a period which according to the editors deserves far more attention than it actually receives. And indeed this journey in the European medical world is quite telling. In addition it provides the reader with the concrete illustration of what historians have suspected: the fundamental role played by the Rockefeller Foundation in support of psychiatric institutions and research projects in the field of mental health, which could be seen as something comparable to a "Marshall plan".

The "plat de resistance" is an archive jewel, Aubrey Lewis's report on his visit to psychiatric centres in Europe in 1937. The famous Australian born psychiatrist is a good read. His text mixes serious considerations and funny anecdotes, thorough descriptions and stern judgements.

But the asset of this publication lies in its valuable historical contextualization. Edgar Jones's essay provides a precise and pertinent background to an understanding of the complex situation of psychiatry where no major theories dominate but where prominent figures are none the less influential sometimes outside their borders. His detailed rendering of the main protagonists' careers—Edward Mapother (1881–1940) and Aubrey Lewis (1900–1975)—their institution—the Maudsley Hospital—and the networks they established, is essential. Katherine Angel's paper contributes to the elucidation of the motivation behind the Maudsley–Rockefeller initiative. She brilliantly demonstrates that the drive for the European tour was not just simply intellectual curiosity but that it served a double

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025727300008759 Published online by Cambridge University Press